

A. D. H. Miller

THE

Evangelical

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM,

I

Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly.

T. C. BLAKE, D.D., EDITOR

IN MEDIO TUTISSIMUS IDIR

Old Series, Vol. VII.—New Series, Vol. II.

NO. I.—JANUARY 1871

NASHVILLE, TENN.

OFFICE OF THE

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM AND SABBATH SCHOOL GEM.

1871.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE

✓ I. Reasons for Preferring the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.	1
By Rev. L. C. RANSOM, Memphis, Tenn.....	
✓ II. The Incarnation—its Object. By Rev. M. L. GORDON,	15
Waynesburg, Pa.....	
✓ III. Language. By Rev. W. H. DAENALL, Lebanon, Tenn....	25
IV. State of the Dead—Scripture Doctrine. By Rev. S. RICH-	
ARDS, Lincoln, Ill.	30
✓ V. The Calls of God. By Rev. T. C. ANDERSON, D.D., Lebanon,	
Tenn.	48
VI. The Spiritual Faculty. By Rev. J. M. HOWARD, Newburg,	
Ind.	58
VII. History of Infant Baptism. By Rev. M. M. SMITH, Bria-	
tow, Ky.	67
✓ VIII. Two Kinds of Decrees. By Rev. W. E. BURKE, Marshall,	
Mo.	76
IX. The Day of the Six Creative Days. By Prof. J. M. SAF-	
FORD, Ph.D., Lebanon, Tenn.....	81
✓ X. Ministerial Education. By Rev. S. T. ANDERSON, D.D.,	
Lebanon, Ohio.....	91
XI. Justification. By Rev. G. W. MITCHELL, Pulaski, Tenn...	106
To our Friends and Patrons.....	115
Book Notices.....	116

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

JANUARY, 1871.

ART. I.—*Reasons for Preferring the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.*

To give these reasons in elaborate detail would make a volume. In this article a very concise statement of them is, therefore, all that can be attempted. The following proposition is here presented:

The doctrines and usages of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church are in accordance with the teachings of the Bible in regard to the Sacraments, Church-government, and Theology.

It is proposed to develop this proposition under the following heads:

I. As to the Sacraments, Cumberland Presbyterians are *Pedobaptists and open communionists.*

The Jews were evidently familiar with the idea of baptism when John the Baptist first began his ministry. (Matt. iii. 5, 6; John i. 25.) When it is asked whence they derived that idea, we find that the ceremonial and symbolical purifications of the Jews are called, in the New Testament (Greek text), "*baptisms.*" (1 Cor. x. 1; Heb. ix. 10; Mark vii. 4, 8.) There is abundant evidence, both from the Old and the New Testaments, that these purifications were usually performed by affusion. Now the *mode* of baptism, as performed by John,

and the Saviour, and his apostles, must have conformed to Jewish ideas; for the Jews never once gainsaid it, as they were accustomed to do all innovations. Hence, that mode could not have been exclusively *immersion*. The history of baptism in the New Testament leads to the same conclusion; for, in every instance, the baptism was administered at the place where the parties were at the time of profession of faith. Not a single instance is given of going off to seek water. The *subjects* of baptism must also, for the foregoing reason, have been in accordance with Jewish ideas. They were accustomed to admit their children to all the rites and ceremonies of their Church. In the four instances of *Gentile* baptisms, given in the New Testament, *household* baptism is expressly declared in three, (Acts xvi. 14, 32; 1 Cor. i. 16,) and strongly implied in the fourth. (Acts x. 48.) The dogma, therefore, that *immersion* only is baptism, cannot be true; nor ought one, we think, to consent to enter a Church that will not admit his children within its pale, and will not allow him to commune with other Christians simply because the latter have not been immersed. Hence the weighty objections to the *Baptist* Church.

II. *As to Church-government, the Presbyterian form is undoubtedly preferable.*

There is but little said in the New Testament as to the details of the organization of the first Christian congregations. It is clear, however, that they were generally organized in the Jewish synagogues, and that their government was modeled after that of the Jewish congregations that worshiped in these synagogues. It is evident that that government was substantially Presbyterian; for the Jewish congregations are everywhere spoken of as governed by elders (Greek, *presbuteroi*). Accordingly, elders are everywhere mentioned as the governing officers in all the New Testament Churches. (Acts xiv. 23; xv. 4, 6, etc.) Of these elders, two, and only two, orders are mentioned; namely, the ruling elders and the teaching elders, or bishops. (1 Tim. v. 17.) There is no evidence whatever of any distinction of rank or authority among the bishops; nor that they acknowledged any supreme head, except the Lord Jesus Christ. Consequently, neither the *claims of the Pope of Rome* can be submitted to, nor can the *Episcopal*

form of government be sanctioned, as both of these require different grades in the ministry of the Church.

At the same time it is evident that the congregations organized by the apostles did not act as so many independent organizations, but had synods or councils which deliberated and rendered judicial decisions for the whole Church. (Acts xv. 1, etc.) Hence, we must believe that the *Congregational* form of government, which maintains the independency of each congregation, is unscriptural. How, then, can one be a Congregationalist? How can he do otherwise than seek his ecclesiastical home in some branch of the Presbyterian Church?

III. *Theologically, Cumberland Presbyterianism rejects the "extremes" both of Calvinism and of Arminianism.*

As to Arminianism, it is not embraced by any Presbyterian Church; and, therefore, even if one believed the system to be true, it could not be adopted without relinquishing a preference for Presbyterian government. But even if this difficulty were removed, we could not adopt Arminianism. That system denies that all who believe in Christ will certainly be saved. It affirms that any of them may, and some of them really do, so fall away as to be finally lost. But the Bible teaches to the contrary very clearly. (Ps. xxxvii. 23, 24, 28; John iii. 16; iv. 14; x. 28; xi. 26; Rom. viii. 35-39.) This doctrine of apostasy is evidently inconsistent with the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers and of their sins to him. "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." (Isa. liii. 11.) "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Rom. x. 4.) "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.) "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." (Phil. iii. 9.) It is also contrary to the doctrine of the intimate and vital relation existing between Christ and believers. "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also." (John xiv. 19.) "And hath put all

things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." (Eph. i. 22, 23.) "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." (Col. iii. 3.) The practical tendency of the doctrine of apostasy is likewise detrimental to the cause of Christ and the interest of souls. By viewing the Christian religion as something which cannot be possessed securely, men are led to depreciate its value, and to postpone seeking it through fear of losing it ere they have need for it in death and eternity. Under a belief of this doctrine, men view the covenant between Christ and believers as something which they can take upon themselves and lay aside at their own option. This leads to inconsiderate and spurious professions of religion; and, as a matter of course, to many apparent apostasies which bring much reproach upon our holy religion. Belief of this doctrine also mars the happiness of believers by keeping them in constant fear of hell. And such fear must, to some extent, hinder their usefulness; for he who is in continual dread of his own destruction, surely cannot have his mind and heart so constantly and entirely enlisted for the welfare of others, as he who has no such dread. Moreover, by making one feel that his perseverance depends so much upon his own good works, this doctrine is likely to lead him to ascribe the glory of his salvation to himself instead of to his Saviour.

The objection to the doctrine of final perseverance, that it destroys man's agency, cannot be entertained; for, when a man becomes a Christian, he *voluntarily* agrees to be the Lord's *forever*, and to confirm him therein is only to do for him what he earnestly asks and freely accepts. This no more interferes with free agency than does marriage, or any other permanent connection in life. In this relationship the believer is no less free than the redeemed in heaven, who, as all admit, can never fall. No more can the plea be received that the believer needs the fear of hell to stimulate him to perseverance in good works; for, if this were true, it would be an injury to him to have that fear cast out. Now, as we know that God will not do aught that would injure his children, and as we are expressly told that the love which he implants in them *does* cast

out fear, (1 John iv. 18,) we know that they do not need that fear. This love is a stronger and holier motive than the fear which it casts out. From the foregoing it is not easy to see how a close reader of the Bible could be satisfied with any Church that holds to Arminianism, and which at the same time has an Episcopal form of government. For these and other reasons, which might be given, *Methodism* is very objectionable.

It is proper to remark that the term Calvinism is used here as synonymous with the "Westminster Confession of Faith," for that Confession is the embodiment of Calvinism as it is presented for adoption or rejection at the present day. The leading objections to the Westminster Confession are herein presented.

1. In Chap. iii., Sec. 1, it is said: "God did from all eternity, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." Now it is certain that *sin does "come to pass."* Therefore, the doctrine is here taught that God *did freely and unchangeably ordain sin*, and that he ordained it because it was his own will, or pleasure, that sin should come to pass. This construction of the language is sustained by Sec. 2 of the same Chapter: "Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath he not decreed any thing because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions." Here it is clearly taught that God decreed sin, not because he foresaw that his creatures would commit sin, nor because he foresaw that endowing them with free agency would result in sin, but simply because *he chose that sin should be*. And so decided was that choice, that he made the decree *unchangeable*; so that sin could not be prevented by any possible contingency! How utterly irreconcilable is this view of the Divine Being with that given in the Scriptures, where he is represented as hating and forbidding sin, and as making the most earnest efforts to prevent it! "Your new-moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them." (Isa. i. 14.)

2. The second objection to the Westminster Confession is,

that, while it disclaims the fatality so apparent in the passage already quoted, it does so, not by explanation, but by a contradictory statement. After the assertion that "God freely and unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass," it adds, "yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established." Now, if a man, of his own will, freely determines that a murder shall be committed, does not the law of God account him, in a moral sense, the author of that murder? And does not the scripturally enlightened judgment decide that he is guilty of crime, no matter who is the actual perpetrator? Again, if there is no "violence offered to the will of the creature," then may not that creature act or not act, in any given instance, as its own will may determine? Surely it can. If it cannot, the freedom of the will is an unmeaning phrase, and the act of the creature is *not unchangeably* fixed. While, therefore, one clause of the sentence asserts that it is unchangeably fixed, the other asserts that it is *not*! Calvinists, indeed, endeavor to evade this difficulty by classing this seeming contradiction under the head of "*mysteries*." It is not, however, a mystery, in the proper sense of that term. A mystery is that which we cannot comprehend; as the doctrine of the Trinity, and the union of the divine and the human nature in Christ. We are conscious that these are beyond our comprehension, but we are not conscious of the presence of any contradiction therein. But in these two clauses of the one sentence of the Westminster, we are conscious of a *comprehensible contradiction*. Any thoughtful mind can recognize this distinction between a mystery and a contradiction, and the unbiased mind will find the latter rather than the former in this passage of the Westminster. Calvinists plead that they find both taught in the Bible, and, therefore, are bound to believe both, whether they can harmonize them or not. But surely the Bible does not contradict itself; and that understanding of its different passages which makes one contradict another must be erroneous. This language of the Westminster is not the language of Scripture, but only a human construction of the meaning of Scripture. It bears upon its very

face the strongest presumptive evidence that the construction is wrong.

3. In the same Chapter, Sec. 3, it is said: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated to everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death;" and in Sec. 4: "These men and angels thus predestinated and foreordained are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished." In Sec. 5, of the same Chapter, it is stated of the elect that they are "chosen in Christ without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving them thereunto." And as the election of some was not caused by any of these things, it follows, logically and inevitably, that the rejection of others was not caused by the want of these things, "nor by any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto." No inference is here drawn which the adherents of the system deny. The doctrine taught, as explained by its own advocates, is, that the election of some and the "passing by" of others is an act of Divine sovereignty, having no other cause than the good pleasure of God's will.

Attention is here called to "An Exposition of the Westminster Confession of Faith, by Robert Shaw, revised by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication, and published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, 1846." It will be observed that this "Exposition" bears unmistakable marks of the sanction and approval of the Presbyterian Church. From this Exposition, (Chap. iii., Sec. 5,) we quote as follows: "The elect are said to have been chosen in Christ, which is indeed the express language of the Scripture. This cannot mean that the mediatory work of Christ was the cause of their election. For, as has been already shown, election proceeds from the mere sovereign will of God. . . . The mediation of Christ was necessary in order that the effect of electing love might be bestowed upon God's elect in consistency with the rights and honor of his justice; but election itself originated in Divine sovereignty, and had no other cause

than the *good pleasure of God's will*." Again, in Sec. 7: "If the reason be inquired why God *passed by* some of mankind sinners, while he elected others to life, it must be resolved into the counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth. No doubt those whom God passed by were considered as fallen and guilty creatures; but if there was sin in them, there was sin also in those who were chosen to salvation; we must, therefore, resolve this opposite allotment into the will of God." The authors of the Confession evidently felt that it would be odious to represent God expressly as *damning* men out of his own good pleasure; and, therefore, they say that he "ordained them to dishonor and wrath for their sin." But who does not know that, according to their system of theology, rejection and damnation, as well as election and salvation, are *inseparable*—that to elect is to save, and to reject is to damn? Moreover, since they teach that God, of his own good pleasure, decreed their sin, they might as well say that he punishes them of his good pleasure, as to say that he punishes them for doing that which is in accordance with his good pleasure.

This doctrine of the Westminster Confession is contrary to the Scriptures in three particulars. First, it represents God as determining to save some and damn others of his creatures without being moved to make the distinction by any thing in their character or conduct; while the Scriptures teach that God is impartial, and decides the destiny of men according to their character and deeds. "For thou renderest to every man according to his work." (Ps. lxii. 12.) "Who will render to every man according to his deeds." (Rom. ii. 6.) "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." (2 Cor. v. 10.) Second, it represents that as *unconditional* which the Bible declares to be *conditional*. Men are plainly told that they shall be saved upon condition that they repent and believe in Christ, and that they shall be damned if they do not repent and believe. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) "I tell you, Nay; but except ye

repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke xiii. 3.) "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. . . . He that believeth on him, is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John iii. 16, 18.) "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts xvi. 31.) Can any thing be more clearly opposed to these passages than this doctrine of the Westminster? Third, it represents God as having pleasure in the death of the wicked, while he has sworn to the contrary: "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live." (Ezek. xxxiii. 11.)

4. The Westminster teaches that Christ died for none but the elect; while the Bible teaches most clearly that he died for all men. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him, is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John iii. 16-18.) "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." (Heb. ii. 9.) "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 2.) It does not seem to be generally understood that the Westminster does teach this doctrine; but nevertheless it is true. In Chap. iii., Sec. 6, it is said: "Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified," etc. "Neither are any others redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified," etc. The word "redeemed" here cannot be taken in its more enlarged sense, so as to include the idea of the actual application of the atonement; for this is expressed by the following terms: "effect-

ually called, justified," etc. It must, therefore, have reference to the death of Christ as an atonement for sin. Again, the position here taken is sustained by the same *Presbyterian* authority already quoted. Shaw's Exposition of this very sentence is as follows: "That Christ died exclusively for the elect, and purchased redemption for them *alone*—in other words, that Christ made atonement only for the elect, and that *in no sense did he die* for the rest of the race. Our Confession first asserts positively that the elect are redeemed by Christ, and then negatively that *none* others are redeemed by Christ but the elect only." Could language be plainer, or more contradictory to the Scriptures referred to in the foregoing?

5. The Westminster Confession of Faith *impliedly* teaches the doctrine of infant damnation. "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved through the Spirit." (Chap. x., Sec. 3.) Calvinists of the present day, it is true, deny that this language implies that some infants are damned. But let us see. Over the gateway of a Jewish cemetery is written: "Jewish infants, dying in infancy, are entitled to burial in this cemetery." This language unquestionably implies these three things: (1) That there are *Gentile* infants in reach of that spot. (2) That deaths do occur among these Gentile infants. (3) That, when Gentile infants die, they are *not* entitled to burial in that cemetery. If the two first were not true, the qualifying word, "Jewish," would be unnecessary. And if the third were not true, the inscription would contain an implied falsehood. The passage before us is precisely parallel. If there are no *reprobate infants*, or if none of these die in infancy, the qualifying word, "elect," is wholly unnecessary. And if reprobate infants, dying in infancy, are saved, the implied falsehood is perfectly obvious. Here, again, attention is invited to the logic of Mr. Shaw's Exposition, as sustaining the position taken in this article. In Sec. 7, of Chap. iii., he says: "Some who allow of personal and eternal election deny any such thing as to reprobation. But the one unavoidably follows from the other, for the choice of some must necessarily imply the rejection of others. Election and rejection are correlative terms; and men impose upon themselves, and imagine that they conceive what it is impossible to conceive, when they

admit election and deny reprobation." Now, apply this logic to Chapter x., and we find that infant reprobation and damnation are taught beyond all question. This remarkable passage might be set down as an instance of incorrect or inappropriate use of terms, if it could be shown that the authors of the Westminster Confession ever distinctly disclaimed the doctrine of infant damnation. But such a disclaimer will be sought for in vain. There is none upon record. The doctrine is entirely consistent with their avowed doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation; and it is known that some of the advocates of the system did, in former days, publicly avow their belief in infant damnation.

6. Another objection to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession, as before mentioned, is that their *practical tendency is bad*. They tend to produce skepticism and infidelity in the minds of the inquiring, to harden the impenitent, to discourage the anxious and sin-laden, and to paralyze the energies of the pious. From logical deduction, such results should be expected without practical developments. But the observation and experience of many around us, and of many who have gone before, testify that these results are fully realized. Not only the opposers of Calvinism are of this opinion, but even its advocates are sometimes constrained to admit its correctness, for it is sustained even by eminent Calvinistic authority. The following quotation is from "Calvinistic Family Library," Vol. 2, "Lectures on Theology, by Rev. John Dick, D.D., published by the Board of the Calvinistic Book Concern," at Xenia, in 1843, Chap. xxxiii., on Predestination, page 193: "Attention should likewise be paid to time and circumstances in teaching this doctrine. None but a thoughtless zealot would bring it forward to meet the view of an inquirer into the truth of our religion, and thus take the direct method to disgust him at the outset. It would be imprudent and cruel to obtrude the subject upon a person who was depressed with a sense of sin and the fear of never enjoying the favor of God. Unless we wish to increase his perplexity and drive him to despair, we would have recourse to other topics. . . . It would betray great unskillfulness, in the work of righteousness, to intermix this subject with an exposition of the com-

mon doctrines of the gospel: when we are speaking of the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, to be sure uniformly to add that he died only for the elect; when we are inviting sinners to come to him, not to let pass the opportunity of reminding them that, unless they are elected, they will never believe; when we call upon men to repent, to take care not to omit that, if they are among the reprobate, they will not repent, as they are given up to hardness of heart. This sort of preaching is injudicious in the highest degree, and calculated to defeat the design of the preacher, if his design were the salvation of souls."

Can we consent to adopt, and teach to our families and friends, as well as to the Church and the world, a doctrine which is liable to such ruinous results—a doctrine which, if once learned, will disgust them with religion when sincerely inquiring, drive them to despair when under conviction, and defeat our effort for the salvation of souls, unless we could perform the impossible task of ordinarily keeping it from their view? From such doctrine, let us most earnestly pray, "Good Lord, deliver us!" *And yet every Presbyterian Church in the United States, except the Cumberland Presbyterian, indorses the Westminster Confession of Faith.* To become a standard-bearer in any other division of the Presbyterian army, necessitates the adoption of that Confession without exception or mental reservation. *This the writer of the present article cannot do.* He has abundant reason, therefore, to be devoutly thankful to God that he finds in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church that which he can adopt, and with which he is well pleased. In this Church alone can he find a Presbyterian form of government separated from those features of Calvinism, which to him seem so harsh, so inconsistent, so dangerous, so unscriptural. In this Church alone can he find a system of doctrines which is free from the objectionable tenets of both Calvinism and Arminianism—a system which teaches that God from eternity decreed whatsoever should be for his glory; that sin, not being for God's glory, he did not decree it, (see Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Chap. iii.); that God determined from eternity to save all who would believe in Christ, together with all other persons who never

become personally accountable; and to damn all who would ultimately reject Christ; that in his fallen estate man is totally depraved, and, when left to himself, wholly incapable of any good; that Christ died for all; that salvation through him is offered to all, *in good faith*; that the Holy Spirit is sent to awaken and enlighten all; that it is only by the aid of the Holy Spirit that any are inclined and enabled to repent and believe; but that the failure of some to repent and believe is not attributable to any partiality in the operations of the Spirit, but to their willful resistance of that Spirit, and neglect and abuse of his proffered aid; that the salvation of believers is of God's sovereign pleasure, and through the merits alone of Christ; but that the damnation of unbelievers is not because God takes pleasure therein, but because they have rejected the only plan of salvation by which God can be just and the justifier of sinners; that all who believe in Christ have his righteousness imputed unto them, are indissolubly united to him, and will certainly be saved. This system presents divine and human agency in harmonious coöperation in the work of salvation. It ascribes all the glory of our salvation to God's free and unmerited grace, and, at the same time, makes the sinner feel that his reprobation and damnation are attributable alone to his willful disobedience and rejection of offered mercy. It affords to the believer every comfort and encouragement that Calvinism can offer, and frees him from that tormenting fear to which Arminianism subjects him. At the same time it presents to the sinner the strongest possible incentives to repent and believe in Christ. Confident that this system is scriptural, consistent with itself, honoring to God and safe for men, it may be said to Calvinists and Arminians: Although you may rejoice in your respective systems, as time-honored and eminently glorious, "yet show I unto you a more excellent way."

There are additional reasons for preferring the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, which may be briefly stated as follows:

1. It is preferable for its standard of *ministerial education*. Its teaching upon this subject is that the education of the ministry should be of the highest order practicable. Accordingly it has ever made vigorous efforts to furnish its ministers

with the very best education available under surrounding circumstances. The correctness of this course will scarcely be doubted by any at the present time. The importance of a highly educated ministry is now almost universally felt and acknowledged. At the same time the Cumberland Presbyterian Church differs from the mother-church in this: the former makes the *minimum* of literary qualification for the ministry to consist in a *good English* education instead of a *classical* education. This is believed to be the better plan. In many sections of the country it is often impossible to furnish an adequate number of ministers with a classical education. The Church and the world must suffer for want of ministers, if a classical education is made an indispensable prerequisite to ordination. It cannot be denied that the history of the Church of Christ, in all ages, proves that many men have made able and useful ministers without a classical education. It must be conceded, also, that the apostles did not require such high literary qualification of all whom they ordained. Such a high *minimum* standard is not, therefore, warranted either by Scripture or the history of the Church, and must result in curtailing the usefulness of any Church that may adopt it.

2. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church originated in a gracious revival of religion, and, consequently, is free from those trammels of formalism and prejudices against "revival measures," which have so much impaired the efficiency of the Presbyterian Church. There is a progressive improvement, in this respect, in the mother-church; but the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is, in this particular, still in the advance, and is likely to remain so. It is not fettered by any deep-seated bias for or against forms, ceremonies, or modes of operation; but feels free to work whenever, wherever, and however God may enable it to do good.

3. The success of the Church indicates that God approves of its organization and perpetuity. At its organization, a little more than a half century ago, it consisted of a *feeble few* in the wilderness; without numerical or pecuniary strength; without colleges or schools; without literature; without *prestige*; with the ill-will of the mother-church, and the general prejudice of other denominations. There was nothing in its

composition or circumstances that, to human reason, could augur great success. Nor did the Church resort to any marvelous or unhallowed means to increase its numbers. Its ministers went forth preaching the great cardinal doctrines of the gospel, laboring to bring sinners to Christ, with a singular indifference about bringing those who were converted into their own fold. But the Lord has blessed this Church. Thousands upon thousands have been converted through its instrumentality. Its borders have been extended and its numbers rapidly augmented. To-day the Cumberland Presbyterian Church stands in the front rank among the religious denominations of the land, as to Christian character, numbers, zeal, and usefulness. "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved; God shall help [*has helped*] her, and that right early." (Ps. xlv. 5.)

ART. II.—*The Incarnation—Its Object.*

OF all the questions embraced within what is usually termed the Christian system of doctrines, none is more difficult of grasp by the unaided human intellect, none is more sublime in its import and results, none is more necessary to us as an article of our faith, or more precious as a part of the ground of our hope of eternal life, than the doctrine of the Incarnation. The union of the human and the divine in one person, although accepted as a fact, must ever remain a mystery. The incarnation of the infinite Jehovah in frail human flesh must ever be regarded as the most significant event possible, and as looking to results not to be measured by our comprehension. The faith which rests not upon the divine-human person of Jesus Christ, will prove powerless to resist the storms of this world. The hope that does not grasp a divine Redeemer, does not enter into that which is within the veil. We cannot have a Christianity without Christ; they stand or fall together; they are one. We do not go to men, asking them, "What think ye of the Christian religion?" The test question

to-day, as it was eighteen hundred years ago, is, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" The force of this question is felt and acknowledged by Christians and skeptics alike. Around the person of Jesus Christ as a center the struggle between faith and unbelief is fiercely waged. In this contest, too, the hardest battles have been fought, and the most signal victories gained for the cause of truth.

In touching upon the doctrine of the Incarnation in the present paper, the reader is assured that the writer is not animated by a polemical spirit. The subject is taken up, not for the purpose of a full and rigid discussion of the doctrine itself, but that it may be used as the gateway to that inviting field, the *design* of the Incarnation. Only the results, therefore, of the controversy will here be considered.

The Psalmist declares that even the wrath of man shall praise God. The thought thus expressed finds a remarkable verification in the history and results of the skeptical treatment of this doctrine of the Incarnation. The Christian faith is not a blind and unreasonable one. It is inconsistent with the character of the divine Author of Christianity that it should be so. He would not have us, in the consideration of this great subject—the one thing of importance in human life—avoid the use of one of the highest faculties that he has given us. The action of the intellect is essential. In the great questions of the immortality and eternal happiness of the soul, we *must* exercise our highest powers of reason. To refuse to do so would be cowardice; and not cowardice only, it would be a violation of that love of truth which Christianity teaches, and which is woven into the very texture of the Bible. But reason has been abused. Men have studied the records of the life of Jesus of Nazareth and the grave and important questions connected therewith, not that they might find the light of life, not that they might behold the Sun of righteousness. They have rather sought to find spots on that Sun; nay, they have tried even to extinguish that Sun, and leave the world to the darkness of eternal despair. What has been the result? So far as their own aims are concerned, their efforts have ended in complete failure. On the other hand, they have been of signal service to Christianity. Its Sun still

shines in undiminished—nay, in increased and increasing, splendor. The fact that Jesus, the Nazarene, once lived is no longer involved in doubt. It is admitted by all the leading skeptics. More than this, some of the highest testimonials to the exalted purity and nobility of his life are from those who rank themselves with his enemies. The testimony of Rousseau is familiar. Speaking of Jesus, he exclaims: "What sweetness, what purity in his manner! What an affecting gracefulness in his instructions! What sublimity in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his discourses! Where is the man, where the philosopher, who could so live and so die, without weakness and without ostentation? When Plato describes his imaginary righteous man, loaded with all the punishments of guilt, yet meriting the highest rewards of virtue, he describes exactly the character of Jesus Christ. . . . The evangelical history bears no marks of fiction. The marks of its truth are so striking and inimitable that the inventor would be a more astonishing character than the hero."

Strauss "admits even a broad basis of historical truth in the Gospels. He concedes that Jesus of Nazareth lived on earth, and that his character—saving the miraculous element so largely blended with the delineation of it—substantially was what it is represented to be by the evangelists."

Rénan calls Jesus "the common honor of all who bear the human heart." "All history is incomprehensible without him." "Whatever may be the surprises of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will grow young without ceasing; his legend will call forth tears without end; his sufferings will melt the noblest hearts; all ages will proclaim that, among the sons of men, there is none born greater than Jesus."

What higher tributes to the moral character of Jesus could we have? It will be seen from the foregoing that the evangelical narratives are admitted to be, in the main, true, excluding, of course, the supernatural element. Rénan goes so far as to admit even the greater part of the Gospel of John. The question is thus shifted. We are no longer required to prove that Jesus lived; that is now admitted. The question now raised is, Was he divine? In other words, taking the gospel

narratives as, in the main, true, do they represent Jesus of Nazareth as human or divine? man or God?

It is well that the question has taken this form. Not because there was even any uncertainty about the existence of Jesus; but because, in the consideration of so vital a subject, the humblest Christian is placed, practically, on a level with the most learned skeptic. It is now merely a question of judgment. Do the first three Gospels, (not including John's Gospel, which is admitted by Rénan, although rejected by others,) portray the character of a mere man? Here the Christian and the skeptic take issue, the one coming to the records with unbiased mind, and with the earnestness with which a belief in the immortality of the soul clothes him, finds in Jesus, the Son of God, the Saviour of men; the other, coming in cold criticism, and in blind self-confidence, sees only the son of a carpenter, the Judean peasant. The one reads the accounts of his conception and birth; he studies his marvelous teaching; he has repeated before him the healing of the sick, the cleansing of the lepers, the restoring of sight to the blind, the raising of the dead; he sees the crucifixion, the wonderful resurrection, and the subsequent appearance of Jesus among his disciples; and, seeing all this, he says: "A greater than man is here." He cries out with the Roman centurion: "Truly this was the Son of God." Accepting the great fact of the incarnation of the Word, the New Testament narratives become so plain and simple, so harmonious in all their parts, that a little child readily understands them. The other, denying the divinity of Christ, attempts to explain those parts of the gospel narratives in which the supernatural appears, by a series of hypotheses. These hypotheses have led them into great absurdities; and, to escape these, new hypotheses have been formed, which, in their turn, lead to absurdities still more glaring. So emphatically true is this, that we may say of them as a whole what Strauss said of Schenkel: "The Christ he gives to the world is more difficult to accept than the Christ of the Gospels."

It is well to notice here that each new attempt to invalidate the supernatural in the life of Jesus, declares that all the previous ones have failed. They must fail. Such interpretations

cannot satisfy honest, inquiring minds, that feel that the interests of eternity are involved. They will not believe that the evangelists narrate events which happened, or could happen, in the life of a mere man. They could not, for instance, believe that the transfiguration was merely a glorious sunrise, in which Jesus stood between his disciples and the sun; that Christ *happened* to discover that the lame man of Bethesda was an *impostor*, and that, therefore, the cure was not miraculous; that in the account of Christ's walking on the sea, all that is meant is that he walked on the shore, or edge, of the sea. If this be all of such events, why, it may well be asked, have we a record of them? Of what value are they to the Christian Church? If Jesus was not divine, why have we a Bible at all? Why did the apostles preach Christ? Why did they lay down their lives for him? These, and many other questions, must forever remain unanswered and unanswerable, if we reject the supernatural element in the life of Christ.

From the earliest ages, the heavens, and the position and motion of the heavenly bodies, received the scrutinizing attention of man. After years of patient, unintermitting toil, the system of Ptolemy was promulgated, and almost universally accepted. Soon, however, other phenomena called for explanation which the Ptolemaic theory could not give. Additional hypotheses were then made, while the system was retained. The phenomena multiplied, and new hypotheses were formed; and they were compelled—

. to gird the sphere
With centric and eccentric scribbled o'er;
Cycle and epicycle, orb in orb,

until they became lost in the mazes of their own system. But when with Copernicus we place the sun in the center of our solar system, and distinguish this from the remainder of the universe, order is at once restored, and the motions of the heavenly bodies, with their results, become intelligible to the humblest intellects. So is it with the gospel narratives. Upon the hypothesis of the rationalists we are bewildered by a multitude of inexplicable phenomena. But make God in Christ the sun and center, and the whole stands before us in

harmony, beauty, and simplicity. It is well, therefore, that the question rests where it does. There are those who, in the pride of their intellect, will see in Jesus only such an one as they are themselves. Others may cry out, in the blindness of their passions, "Thou hast a devil!" But candid, earnest minds will see in him the divine element so plainly stamped, that they will confess, with those of his own time, "This is the very Christ;" and multitudes, thank God, even though naturally doubting and hesitating as was Thomas, will, as they stand in his presence, exclaim with Thomas, "My Lord and my God!"

Divine revelation not only sets forth the life of Jesus, and attributes to him a divine nature and power, but it declares also the motive which led to the Incarnation. It points to that attribute of God of which the Incarnation is the expression, "For God so *loved* the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "God is love;" therefore he became incarnate. Let us examine this a little more minutely, that we may see how the Incarnation is a manifestation of God's love.

I. Let it be observed that the love of God is manifest in the Incarnation, inasmuch as by it alone does man attain to a perfect knowledge of the *will of God*. Although created in the image of God who is a pure Spirit, man dwells in a material body and cannot communicate with another spirit save through the senses. He is, more or less, dependent upon his senses for all his knowledge. His mind is awakened into activity by appeals to it through the senses; and, in after life, the greater part of his knowledge is received through the same channels. Now God, in all his dealings with man, appeals to his senses. There was special need of this in the infancy of the race, and the Bible indicates its use. It was a flaming sword that stood as a barrier to the return of our first parents into Eden. In a burning bush did God appear unto Moses. The "Angel of the Lord" often made his appearance to the Old Testament characters. Moses was chosen to be to the people of Israel in the place of God. All these were for a dispensation which was preparatory, which was typical of the higher one that

was to come. They were, to some extent, obscure and unsatisfying. Even in the case of Moses, the "man of God," the type of the incarnated Saviour, through whom the most direct and explicit communications were made to the children of Israel, there was not found all that man needed. Frail humanity asserted itself, and Moses rested under the anger of God. And he himself, looking with prophetic eye down through the ages to come, spoke of the Prophet which God should raise up like unto himself. Through Christ, who was that prophet, was God's will concerning man made known most perfectly. As *man speaking to men* in the freedom of familiar intercourse, his communication with men was the most intimate and complete possible. Had Christ come as a being either higher or lower than man, that communication would have been impaired. But there may be seen an especial provision of love in his association with a few chosen disciples. With them was he united in the closest companionship. To him they came for sympathy in joy and in sorrow. All their wants were laid at his feet, and so fully and freely were they met and satisfied, that even in the eyes of his enemies he thus exhibited one of the strongest proofs of his divinity. Now these things, being recorded by the pen of inspiration, are preserved for the guidance and consolation of God's children in all ages; so that millions have found it in their heart to exclaim, with Peter, "Lord, thou hast the words of eternal life!"

II. It may be noticed, secondly, that the love of God is manifest in the Incarnation, inasmuch as by it alone does man attain to a complete knowledge of the *character* of God. In God's dealings with the Jews, different elements of his character were, from time to time, revealed to them. For examples, in his power displayed in the destruction of their enemies; in the thunders of Mount Sinai; in his care for them in their deliverance from the Egyptians; in the manna found in the desert, and the water gushing forth from the rock; in the pillar of cloud and pillar of fire which went before them; and in his hatred of sin, as manifested by the destruction that fell upon those who disobeyed his commands. But all these representations are imperfect. Men were then in a rude state, and were moved by *force* rather than by *love*. Hence, in all

God's manifestations of himself, his omnipotence is the prevailing characteristic. It may be noticed, too, that our ideas concerning spirits in general are necessarily vague. Much of our knowledge of angels, for example, is negative. They have not bodies as we have. They are not fettered by material things. They are not subject to death. It is so with our ideas of God. We express our knowledge of him by giving him the qualities of men, and by removing all limitations. He is *all-knowing, all-present, all-potent, without limitation*. Such knowledge is too vague and indefinite for the personal wants of the human soul. The mind is prepared, therefore, to perceive the love of God in incarnating himself in the man Jesus. There is no longer any indefiniteness. We are not attributing qualities which we see in men to a being entirely different—a being of whose nature we can have but a dim conception. But we see before us a man, a complete man, made like unto ourselves, with the assurance, at the same time, that the character which we see in him is the reflection, the embodiment, of the character of God. We see, too, that God is not merely a God of wisdom and power, but also a God of love. We see Jesus, in his intimate relationship to his disciples, exhibiting, in the highest degree, all the tenderer qualities of man's nature; and we are thus assured that the heart of God throbs in closest sympathy with our own.

The human mind loves the concrete. The abstract is difficult of grasp; and even when the mind once possesses it, it soon tires of it. It soon flies from the idea to its sign or symbol; or, rather, it retains firmest grasp of the idea as it is embodied in its symbol. Here lies the power of example, which, as we have been told from childhood, is far stronger than mere precept. Hence the great power of the life of Jesus. Thousands have turned to it in acknowledgment of its power, over whom mere theoretical teaching had no influence whatever. They see Jesus, for the love he bore men, quitting heaven, that he might dwell on earth. They see him living a life of utter self-denial, that he might do good to others. They see him loving and serving all men, irrespective of social position, education, or wealth. They see him leading men into a higher and happier life in this world, and implanting

within them a well-founded hope of eternal life in the world to come. They see him relieving the misery that is in the world, and, directly or indirectly, combating all the means which Satan employs to fill the earth with sin and sorrow. Can they doubt that such a being is the friend of man? Can they doubt his interest in man's welfare? his love for him? But when they know that all this is an expression of God's character, can they refuse to love and honor God? Can they think of him as "putting down some and raising up others" in the merely arbitrary action of his own will? Can they think of him as acting from motives of hatred or revenge? Can they think of him as sending calamities on the race for no good purpose? Can they think of him as punishing them eternally, undeserved? No. He will appear to them rather as the loving friend, who is ready to do any thing for their good. Thank God for such a revelation of himself!

III. But, again, the love of God is manifest in the Incarnation, inasmuch as by it deliverance from sin is made possible to man.

Here opens the great subject of the Atonement, about which so much has been said and written. The reference to it must be brief; for it is proposed merely to affirm the scriptural doctrine that the Incarnation was in some way necessary for man's deliverance from the power of sin. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." Whatever view of the Atonement may be taken, we must accept this doctrine. If we hold with Socinus and his followers, that Jesus was a mere man, then his *example* was necessary to lead men into a higher life. If we accept the moral theory, then the Incarnation was necessary as a *display of God's love to man*. If we take the higher, sacrificial theory, (which by no means excludes the two former,) then the Incarnation was necessary that Jesus might become the *vicarious sacrifice*. Whatever theory of the Atonement we adopt, we must hold to the scriptural doctrine, that for man's deliverance from sin it was necessary for Christ Jesus to come into the world. "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners." Had any thing less sufficed, he would not have so humbled himself. "In this was manifest the love

of God toward us, because that he sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

In this article it had been the writer's intention to dwell somewhat at length on the person of Christ, and upon the questions involved in the generally accepted doctrine of the two natures in one person; but want of space prevents. Nothing can be done, therefore, except to make a brief reference to it. No subject in the whole range of theological thinking is more profound than the doctrine of the union of the human and the divine natures in the person of Christ. And it may be well to confess here, that it is a subject which the writer does not profess to be able to fathom. All that any one can do is to receive by faith the inspired teaching that it is so. But what, it may be inquired, do the Scriptures teach?

1. They teach that Christ was God, the equal of the Father. This subject has already been dwelt upon. Christ constantly affirmed his equality with the Father. "I and my Father are one."

2. The Scriptures teach that Christ was man, a perfect man. This is an important truth, and one, too, frequently lost sight of. Christians generally have loose conceptions of the *humanity* of Christ. Do not many think of Jesus Christ as the *Word* dwelling in a human body merely?—that the divine element stood in the relation to him that our souls stand in to our bodies? It is greatly feared that such a belief is not confined to Apollinaris and his followers. Do not others, who would not deny that Jesus Christ had a human soul, often think of him as so much under the influence of the divine element in his nature that the human was not brought into exercise? And so we have God in Christ, the infinite God, resisting and overcoming the trials and temptations to which *men* are subject. But such a view robs the person of Jesus of one of its chief glories. He was God; but he was man also. The *Word* became *flesh*. He was tempted in all points as we are. "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make re-

conciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." His temptation was *real*—as real as are yours and mine. His temptation was *human* temptation. "He *suffered* being tempted." He, as a man, overcame these temptations; otherwise, his virtue would not have been *human* virtue. If it was not human virtue, his example is not one for our imitation. That the omnipotent God should overcome sin, is no proof that *we* can. No; Jesus Christ was human. He was, so to speak, the most human of all men that ever lived. He was the typical man, the "Son of man." He lived as a man. He thought as a man. His relations to his fellow-creatures were the same as those of other men. He was tempted as a man, and as a man he overcame his temptations. By his successful resistance to the powers of Satan, he showed that it is possible *for us* to do the same. "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind." "As he which called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation."

ART. III.—*Language.*

I. "THIS word, originally derived from the Latin *lingua* (tongue), in its most general sense, means the faculty which God has given to men of communicating their perceptions and ideas to one another by means of articulate sounds. Metaphorically, its signification is extended to every other mode by which ideas may be made to pass from mind to mind." Language is not only the expression of thought, but also of feeling, and of both thought and feeling. Communications from mind to mind do often, if not generally, convey more than perceptions and ideas. The expression, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," gives us an idea, a thought. The heart is not necessarily moved. David's mourning exclamation, "O my son Absalom! O Absalom, my son, my son!" is, perhaps, exclusively an expression of feeling.

And our Saviour's words, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee," combines an expression of both thought and feeling. The truth of this position is attested by consciousness. The soul (that which thinks, feels, and wills) is a unit. It may exist in an intellectual state, entertaining thought, distinct from emotion; in an emotional state, possessed by feeling, distinct from thought; or in a complex state, combining both. Language is but the expression of these thoughts and feelings.

The mode of communication is not restricted to articulate sounds. That is the most general, but, by no means, the only mode. Where it fails, other methods are resorted to. A corrugated brow may tell of pain or anger; a smiling mouth may bespeak gladness; a tearful eye may tell of a wounded spirit. Every movement may be an embodied thought. The reader will remember the dispute between Cicero and Roscius, the latter contending that he could express a sentiment in a greater variety of ways by gestures than the former by the use of different phrases. And furthermore, the writer believes that the soul has modes of communication distinct from the use of the bodily organs—a language purely spiritual, either heavenly or devilish. It is doubtless true that, while in the body, it is confined to the use of the body; but, when this mortal shall put on immortality, it will speak in the dialect of the Spirit Land. Moses and Elias, upon the mount of transfiguration, communed with each other and with our Saviour. Moses had been buried generations before—"and no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day;" yet his soul, "freed from clay," had a language suited to its exalted state.

II. Language belongs to the soul alone; it is the living, active soul that speaks, whether by sounds or other symbols. While in the flesh, the organs of the body are used in our communications with each other, but the body has no language. It is material, "formed of the dust of the ground." Matter is inert, and moves not of itself. Power from without must come upon it. With the body, that power is the living soul that inhabits it, and controls its wonderful machinery. The dead speak not, and there is no language in the grave. The soul thinks and feels, and communicates its thoughts and

feelings to other minds. The medium of communication is language. This is the teaching of philosophy, and consciousness gives its witness that philosophy is true. The case of Lazarus and the rich man points to the fact that the soul, though separated from the body by death, still possesses a language. "This account is either a *parable* or a *real history*. If it be a *parable*, it is what *may be*; if it be a *history*, it is that which *has been*. . . . The account is equally instructive, in whichever of these lights it is viewed." The rich man and Abraham communicated with each other, even across the "great gulf." Thoughts and feelings were uttered in the language of eternity.

"The angels which kept their first estate" are pure spirits. They have never been in bodies like ourselves. And yet they have a language. Over the fields of Palestine a multitude of the heavenly host praised God, saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." The "shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night," heard and understood. John the Divine, "heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

We would speak reverently of the Divine Majesty. Our Lord is "a most pure Spirit," and yet he reveals his will to his creatures. He has a language which is his own. His servant heard his voice, and yet saw no figure, no resemblance.

Thus we may see that, from man up to the gradations of being to God, language belongs to the soul alone—to mind, to spirit. It bears the blessings and the curses of time, and will be burdened with the glory and the woe of eternity.

III. "Unable to solve the problem of the origin of language, Plato supposed it to be divinely inspired. The same view has not been uncommon among Christians. But Democritus, Epicurus, and Cicero, among the ancients, and Monbodo, Adam Smith, Dugald Stewart, and most modern scholars, favor the natural creation of speech by the innate faculties of man." Where the learned have differed we would walk humbly.

The soul was made for society. "And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone." From the days of our first progenitor until now man has not been alone. In every age and every clime society exists. Isolation would be a monstrosity, and is doubtless an impossibility. So far as we know, the same law applies to celestial beings. We "see through a glass darkly," and yet we have learned that their number is "thousand thousands." As a consequence of this law, God gave to the soul the power of language—the power to communicate its thoughts and feelings to other intelligences. It is, therefore, a natural attribute of the soul, emanating from the "Author of every good and perfect gift." We must accept the conclusion, or else meet the difficulty, that God made the soul for society, and yet did not give it a power without which society could not exist. Thus formed, with its broad fields of thought and never-failing fountains of emotion, the soul is placed in society. In the exercise of its royal power, it communicates those thoughts and feelings to "living souls" around it. That communication gives us language. This is true, whether the soul is "in the body or out of the body."

IV. In the body the soul uses the bodily organs in its communications. We know not that it possesses a language independent of these, unless, indeed, in worship there be voiceless spirit-utterances between the soul and God. Where it can be understood, it uses the organs of speech, and conveys its thoughts and feelings in articulate sounds. If unsuccessful by this method, it resorts to others. We have illustrations of this in common life. When we meet a stranger, and have occasion to confer with him, we present our thought by the voice—we speak to him. If he fails to understand, we endeavor to convey our idea by motions of the hands, of the arms, or of the body. "And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter." What a world of meaning in that look! Peter understood it, and, grieving for his denial of his Master, "went out and wept bitterly."

We cannot suppose that Eve was without a language when she was brought to Adam. In the exercise of the powers which God had given her, she communed with her husband in

the sinless language of Eden. Thought and feeling passed between them, clear, distinct, and understood. The little child presents its baby-thought in the babblings and cries of infancy. We ourselves are but "children of larger growth"—

Infants crying in the night ;
Infants crying for the light ;
And with no language but a cry.

In a little while we hope to leave these earthly cryings, and speak the happy "language of Canaan." We may not catch the idea of the little one, but it is because we do not understand its language. Teaching our children to talk is but an effort to teach their souls to use that language with which we are familiar, and which we have found most useful. If a child has voice, we teach it to use articulate sounds; if it is dumb, we give it the language of the fingers. Left to itself, we believe it would still have a language of its own—far inferior to ours, of course, but still it would be a medium of communication.

The different languages of earth, such as the English, German, French, and others, with their improvement, are but the results of the soul's efforts to increase the ease and accuracy of communication. It has found by experience that by sounds and characters established as symbols of thought, we have by far the most useful medium of communication. Hence, the soul has adopted spoken and written language. The sound given when the word *God* is pronounced, symbolizes the thought of our Creator; and wherever the English language is spoken, the hearer does not mistake our idea when that sound is uttered. So also the letters G-o-d combined, indirectly represent the same thought, and we always receive it wherever we find them written. As society advances, we would naturally expect the soul to give its improving touches to these systems. Social development resembles that of individuals. In early years, each speaks as a child; in maturer years, each speaks as a man. But why are not all dialects one? We cannot tell. It may be that sin prevents it—darkening and enfeebling our minds as we know it does. Doubtless climate, and other local circumstances, exercise a control-

ling influence. And perhaps, above all, the wisdom of the Father sees that a confusion of tongues is best.

Mysterious, immortal Mind! weird, Spirit-essence! we wonder at thy majesty and thy gifts. Thou canst comfort and bless, or sadden and curse. Out on the ocean as we ride may the voice that we hear from thee come with a melody akin to that which floats from the angels' harps of gold! So shalt thou glorify God in a beautiful mission of love.

V. "Out of the body," the soul will use a language purely spiritual. It will be the dialect of heaven or the wail of death, as it lives with the saved or lost. Of the nature of the heavenly language we know nothing. The angels use it and give their praises to God. Each weary pilgrim that reaches that shining shore, takes up its bright syllables and shouts the glory of his deliverance. We are told that, in other days, "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech." The confusion of tongues was a judgment from God. When death takes the believer hence, and all judgments are left behind, may we not believe that, as it was on earth, so there "the whole heaven will be of one language and of one speech"? If so, then indeed we will "sing as angels do," and with them lift up the grand acclaim: "Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might be unto our God forever and ever!"

ART. IV.—*State of the Dead—Scripture Doctrine.*

ALWAYS, and everywhere, there has existed in the minds of men a belief, of some kind, in the future existence of the soul. The bare statement of the varied modifications of this belief would fill volumes. The limits of a brief article necessitate the most general statements, or a selection of some particular modification of the subject for consideration. The doctrine of Hades claims our present attention. Of this there are so many modifications, that it is difficult to give any statement, to all the parts of which any advocate of the doctrine would give assent. The subject will be here investigated in the

light of the following fundamental principles of linguistic science and hermeneutics.

1. All language must be interpreted by means of some prototype existing in the mind of the hearer or reader; without this, language can have no possible meaning to any but the one who uses it. As easily could the eye see without light. It consists of all previous knowledge of the meanings of words, their combinations and usages, and of every thing else upon which the expressive power of words and sentences depends.

2. Accordingly, any one wishing to be understood, must adapt himself to the state of knowledge of his hearer or reader, by using such words in such combinations as will not only reproduce his own idea to his own mind, but convey it to him whom he addresses.

3. After the incipient stage of root-formation in language, new ideas are not expressed by new words and phrases, but by elements previously known. When new elements of expression are coined and used to convey new ideas, there must be some kind of accompanying explanation, or the new idea will be conveyed to no one.

4. The beginnings, *prima nominata*, of language, being phenomenal, and pertaining almost wholly to physical objects, it occurs that moral qualities and actions, intellectual relations, abstract ideas and invisible things, are named and expressed by terms of a phenomenal and physical character.

For brevity's sake, illustrations are here omitted, as it is presumed that the foregoing principles will become plain in application to the subject in hand. No principles, in fact, are more fundamental, none of more general and constant application in hermeneutics. They are the true *touchstone* by which every interpretation is to be tried, inasmuch as there should be none which does not involve one or all of them. They are at the foundation of most of the numerous canons of interpretation. In the violation of them are found nine-tenths of the errors in Biblical hermeneutics.

The modern doctrine of Hades, as taken from the most reliable sources, is substantially as follows: Hades is the place to which all disembodied spirits go immediately after death, there to remain until the resurrection. According to some, it

has two apartments—one for the blessed, (Paradise,) the other a place of torment for the wicked. A third place is added by some, which is to be the eternal abode of the wicked after the judgment, called Gehenna, the lake of fire. Others teach that, before the crucifixion, the righteous were in Hades awaiting the fulfillment of God's promise, before they could be actually pardoned and admitted to heaven. Such hold that no one experienced forgiveness before the death of Christ; but some maintain that, since the crucifixion, pardon has been granted, and the righteous go at once to heaven after death; while others believe that nearly all the dead will remain in Hades until the resurrection. By almost all of this class of interpreters it is taught that while Christ's body was in the grave, his spirit descended to Hades and preached to the disobedient antediluvians, making an offer of salvation to those who had not heard of him in this life. It is also held by some that Hades is a half-way station for the evangelization of the heathen and of departed infants. The Universalists who believe in a Hades at all, regard it as a place of reformatory punishment from which all will come forth fitted for heaven. With Roman Catholics it is a purgatory, in which pious souls, not yet perfect, are purified by suffering, from which, however, they may be released by imputation of works of supererogation, and of the sufferings of Christ, which were in excess of what was necessary to redeem the world, and by virtue of the sacrifice in the mass, all of which form a treasure of the Church to be disposed of (by sale) for this purpose and for indulgence. Those who die out of the pale of the holy mother-church go right to hell without any of these benefits. We shall not handle each and all of these theories separately. Before fundamental investigation they fall together.

In discussing a subject so weighty, the writer cannot but feel some diffidence, being fully aware that men of undoubted piety, distinguished talent, and profound learning, have handled it before, and have reached conclusions widely differing from those to which the investigations in this article lead. One can move on, however, with some confidence under the motto: "He that follows after truth has his own *star* within himself." The principal groundwork of their interpretations

is in the prototype by which they explain certain terms involved. With due deference to scholarship and weight of authority, the right is claimed of investigating this prototype which they have put into our hands, by stating the grounds or reasons of their interpretations. To the task, then.

Sheol is derived from a word which means, *to hollow out, to dig out, to excavate*. Accordingly, its primary meaning is, *hollow*. It was applied as an adjective to any thing or place that bore the appearance of being hollowed out. The prototype, according to which it was changed from this phenomenal to a substantive character, to denote the regions beneath the earth, is found in the philosophical notions of the constitution of the universe. The ancients regarded the earth as a level plain, surrounded by water, and bounded by the lower edge of the solid concave of the firmament. Above were the three heavens, or celestial universe, called by the Hebrews (תְּבֵלָה) *tebhel*, by the Greeks (κόσμος) *cosmos*. Below was a vast region, called by the Hebrews *Sheol*, because they conceived it to be a vast hollow; and by the Greeks *Hades*, because to them it was the invisible region. Thus *Sheol*, an attributive, phenomenal term, became a proper name, to designate the regions below the solid earth. Its primary application was purely philosophical. Its origin was in a false conception, there being no such place in the universe as that which it designates.

It is of the utmost importance to trace the historic steps by which this term reached its application to the revealed idea of a future state. Did God first appropriate it to this purpose, or did men, in their ignorant speculations? If the former be true, the prototype by which the first revelation on the subject was understood, was merely the false philosophical notion. If the latter, the prototype was the mythological notion of the future abode and state of the dead. The history must, of course, be traced in the records, the oldest of which being acknowledged to be the Scriptures. From them it appears that the theory of an underworld abode of the dead existed long before any record was given, and even before the record represents that Inspiration appropriated the term or sanctioned its use. In proof of this, the reader is referred to Gen. xxxvii. 35. The exposition, in which these points will appear plain, is reserved

for another place. As evidence of the human origin of these speculations or myths, they are found among all the Oriental nations, traceable to the most ancient times. The deep ignorance of the physical region beneath, the dark cloud of sorrow, the dimness of the closed eye, and the gloomy avenue to the chill, damp sepulcher—all associated with death, and heightened by strong imagination—were fit antecedents to the gloomy idea of the future abode of the dead. There are clear indications that both Hebrews and Greeks derived these myths from the ancient Egyptians. During the period now under consideration, (that before any written record,) *Sheol* retained its literal meaning, as an important philosophical term, even in the mythical sense. The myth was formed, not by changing the meaning of the word, but by adding mythical ideas to that which it conveyed. There was no division of the place, nor distinction between the future condition of the righteous and that of the wicked. *Sheol* was the final resting-place of all alike. This fact has an important bearing on the subject in hand. It cannot be shown that the Greeks ever regarded Hades as the intermediate state for the *multitude*, nor that any but the distinguished few would ever ascend starry Olympus. Now, according to principles previously laid down, when God would make a revelation to the understanding of men, there was no way in which to do it, but to use their own language in its accepted meaning, or, if with a new meaning, to indicate the same, or, if in new terms, to explain them. The last he did not do; which of the others did he adopt? It is not supposed that a single enlightened man now thinks that God ever revealed or confirmed the physical theory of the universe as involving the lower, cavernous regions. Church councils long since ceased to decree that such is the infallible interpretation of Scripture, and that all are heretics who dare to deny it. It will be seen that, in the Scriptures, there are frequent poetic allusions to this theory, but without the least sanction of Divine authority for its correctness.

If God does not reveal nor sanction the false physical theory, does he the mythical? It has already been shown that the mythical theory involves *essentially* the literal and physical one, so that the former could not be sanctioned without the

latter. It is, therefore, as absurd to allow that God sanctioned the truthfulness of the mythical, as that he did that of the physical. Moreover, it will be shown in another place, on the best authority, that the Jews did *not* change their theory of the myth, until after the canon of the Old Testament had been closed. Nor did they change their theory of the universe. It follows irresistibly, from these considerations, that the myth cannot be the prototype for the interpretation of language referring to an intermediate state, since it has been seen that it contains nothing corresponding to this idea. In like manner it has been shown—and the best of authorities will be cited to sustain the position—that, among the Jews, it contained nothing corresponding to the separation of the righteous and the wicked, and their different abodes. In the proper place it will be shown that they had such ideas, and what, too, were their character and origin. The point here is, that these ideas cannot be deduced from a single passage by interpreting it in accordance with the myth as it was in the minds of the Jews during all the period of the formation of the Old Testament canon. This position saps the foundation of the interpretations of all that class who deduce these ideas by application of the myth. They accomplish the feat of bringing something out of nothing! Their numerous mistakes in interpretation arise from two fundamental errors. They erroneously take it for granted that Inspiration uses these terms strictly in accordance with the *usus loquendi* of the speculations of men. Their next, and equally as great, error, is in applying these speculations, or mythical notions, to ideas connected with them, which were not so connected until a later period.

So far, then, as Old Testament teaching is concerned, the whole theory is exploded, and vanishes in a mist of error. Its supporters have been driven from the last ditch, and leave us the battle-ground which we shall continue to hold unless our position be destroyed. Their mode, both of attack and defense, is very desultory, resting upon such passages as seem capable of serving their ends. The whole matter, indeed, may well be allowed to rest here; but the reader may desire to have these principles applied to particular passages. There

can be no objection thus to test them as well as by direct reasoning here, in doing which all pledges previously made will be redeemed.

The earliest passage in which *Sheol* occurs is in Gen. xxxvii. 35: ". . . and he said, For I shall go down to *Sheol* unto my son mourning." The whole context shows that this is a historical account of the state of mind with which the patriarch bore the loss of his son, closing with the quotation in which he himself expressed his grief. Taking the language in its literal and full import, it only expresses Jacob's views and feelings. It contains, therefore, no revelation nor Divine sanction of the theory, unless it be supposed that he spoke under inspiration. Of this there is no evidence; but, on the contrary, the principal idea in his mind, the cause of his intense feeling, was an error. Joseph was neither dead nor in *Sheol*. No farther argument is necessary to prove that there is here no Divine revelation, nor sanction of a single idea of the doctrine. But as the term is here used, it is important to an understanding of the whole subject, to ascertain the true meaning, and to show what relation the term has to this meaning. By reference to the passage in question, it will appear upon the face of it that the leading thought is simply Jacob's intense and inconsolable grief. All the terms and phrases are subordinate to the expression of this. By reference to Gen. xlii. 38; xliv. 31, the meaning of both the terms and the phrases may be found. In the latter passage it is said: "It shall come to pass when he seeth that the lad is not with us, that he will die; and thy servants shall bring down the gray hairs of thy servant, our father, with sorrow to *Sheol*." Every one must admit that "gray hairs of thy servant" is a figurative expression for "thy old servant," or, "thy servant in old age," Jacob being then old, and that the fact was introduced by Judah to strengthen his plea. This being admitted, the expression, "shall go down to *Sheol*," is synonymous, in the main thought, with "shall bring the gray hairs of thy servant, our father, in sorrow to *Sheol*." Now, from the immediately preceding context, this latter phrase is shown to mean that Jacob would not only sorrow until death, but that the grief caused by the conduct of his sons would hasten his

death. So, in the first passage before us, Jacob declares, in figurative language, that his grief is inconsolable, for he will sorrow all his life, which will be shortened thereby. "*Sheol*," then, is used figuratively, not for the grave, but for the place or state of the dead; and "go down to *Sheol*" is a figurative expression, meaning, not "go down to the grave," but *to die*, for that is the meaning of both. When used figuratively, they are perfectly synonymous, signifying to die, one figure being based on the grave, the other upon the supposed place of the soul after death. The allusion is doubtless to the literal *Sheol*; that is, this figure is founded on the idea of a literal *Sheol*, the receptacle of the soul, just as the other is based on the idea of a literal grave, the receptacle of the body. But, "Stop," says one; "you are admitting too much when you admit that the basis of the figure is the idea of a literal *Sheol*." The whole truth must be admitted fearlessly, though the heavens fall. So far is the admission from weakening any previous position, founded in truth, it may be asserted that it involves neither human nor Divine sanction for the actual *Sheol*. Whether it be supposed that Jacob believed or not, his leading meaning is the same, viz., intense grief. This fact is proved by the consciousness of one's own experience. The meaning, of which the passage is very expressive, is obvious to the mind, though one may not believe a syllable of the theory upon which it is ultimately based. This is so with the mind of every one, because, on fundamental principles of language laid down at the beginning, *words* and *phrases*, used subordinatedly to express new leading ideas, are constantly taken from their primitive literal meanings, and used in new ones. To illustrate: Among the profane there is this common, blasphemous expression, "If you don't, I'll send you to hell;" meaning, I will put you to death. Our word *hell* means, primarily and literally, a hollow place, and was used to express the same literal idea as did *Sheol*. Not one in a thousand, using it, knows that it ever had that meaning, and consequently never makes those using it responsible for the false philosophy and mythology. Such is the force of this law that, in the most common use of language, we employ but few words with their primitive meanings.

Since penning some of the foregoing, the writer heard the following language used in a plain sermon: "Both the *men* and the *times* are in the hands of, and are molded by, Him who sitteth upon the *circle* of the earth." Substitute for the latter part the phrase, "who is everywhere, and looketh over the whole earth," and you still have the same meaning as at first. And though "who sitteth upon the circle of the earth" is based on one of the essential ideas connected with the ancient theory of the universe, no one held the professor who used it responsible for the correctness of the theory. Though almost all understood his main idea, how few knew the origin of the expression! Why, then, should Isaiah, who used the language before him, be held responsible for the theory? Nay, more, why should God, under whose inspiration Isaiah spoke, be charged with these errors? For farther illustration, read Job xxvi., in which the omnipotence and sovereignty of God are portrayed in terms of this false philosophy. Read also the prayer of Hannah, in the closing verse of which is this remarkable language: "The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth." It was at the ends of the earth where the blue concave seems to meet the horizon that the *circle* of the earth was formed, according to the ancient theory. The main thought conveyed is plain: the Lord shall judge all men. But this is subordinate to another thought: God is the sovereign disposer of all things, as the context plainly shows. There is no end to similar examples, to be found on almost every page of the Bible; but citations need not be multiplied. In this discussion a very important point has been reached. It has been shown, not only how the terms of false philosophy and of mythology may be used by a speaker or writer without his sanctioning, believing, or even knowing, their primary import. What is more to the point, it has been shown that terms involving the main ideas of the *Sheol* doctrine are actually so used. Any term connected with any subject may be so used, by making it subordinate to the expression of an idea connected with a new or different subject.

The reader is now prepared for the statement that *Sheol*, and all terms and phrases connected in any way with the false philosophy and false eschatology which gave it birth, cannot be

found in the Bible, in a single passage, in any other than a subordinate position. Either the words hold a subordinate relation to the thought expressed in the sentences in which they occur, or the sentences are subordinate to the expression of a leading contextual thought. This conclusion is reached from the fact that, if used in a principal position as containing the leading thought, the author confirms the philosophy and mythology involved. But it has been seen that this is absurd, that God cannot sanction either the philosophy or the mythology of the Jews without sanctioning error. Furthermore, we may challenge investigation from Genesis to Revelation. In the direct historic account of creation, we have no mention of *Sheol*, because there is no such physical region; nor is the assertion directly made by God or man on any subsequent page of revelation. Not so of the heavens, though many passages are found involving the false notions of the Jews with regard to them, in which heaven and associated terms are used in the subordinate relation as explained of *Sheol*.

There is another class of passages, quite numerous, in which the term *Sheol* is used figuratively, the figures being based, *not* on the literal sense, as in the class already explained, but on a figurative sense already existing. Just as our word hell, in the sentence illustrated, is the basis of a third figurative expression, meaning to put to death, not in its literal sense, as denoting the hollow regions below the earth, but in its figurative meaning to denote a place of punishment. *Sheol* is very frequently used in this secondary figurative way. First, to express great suffering, physical and mental. The passages are too numerous to be cited. They involve such expressions as *the sorrows of Sheol*, *the pains of Sheol*, *to bring or cast down to Sheol*, in which latter terms God often threatens chastisement upon Israel and other nations, and upon haughty kings. It is self-evident, upon inspection, that these passages contain no threat, unless *Sheol* be used figuratively as a place of punishment; for they are used in connection with the severest denunciations; and, at the same time, it is plain that God does not intend to cast them into literal *Sheol*.

An important inquiry, at this stage of the subject, is, What is the prototype of this figurative use of the term? It cannot

be the mythological notions of the Jews or Greeks; for, according to Dr. Robinson, (Greek and English Lexicon of New Testament, Art. Hades,) there is no division or distinction of place in the *Sheol* of the Old Testament—the one for the righteous, the other for the wicked. The same thing is asserted by Jahn, in his *Archæology*, Sec. 314. In Gesenius's Hebrew Lexicon we find no trace of any such distinction in any of the terms. Says Dr. Robinson, in the above article: "The idea of *Sheol* is found among the later Jews [meaning those after the close of the Old Testament canon] more developed and assimilated to the Greek Hades. The souls of the righteous and the wicked were held to be separated; the former inhabiting the region of the blessed, the inferior Paradise, or Eden, of the rabbins; while lower down was the abyss called Gehenna, or Tartarus, in which the souls of the wicked are in torment." To the same effect is the testimony of Alger, who devoted twelve years to the study of the history of the doctrine of a future state. (See his *History of Doctrine of Future State*.) It seems, then, that while the term was used figuratively for a place of punishment, there was nothing in the myth corresponding to this idea. Inspiration must have furnished the prototype and applied the term accordingly in its figurative sense. Says Jahn, as before referred to: Though we find the absence of separate terms to express the ideas of future reward and punishment, they (the Jews) must have inferred them from their general notions of the justice of God. The precise language of the quotation is not here given. To this may be added the following: They were plainly taught these ideas by direct assertions on the subject. For example, take Psalm i., in which it is said: "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous. For the Lord knoweth [approveth] the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish." Final judgment, and reward, and retribution beyond the grave, are taught no more plainly in the New Testament than in this passage. Observe, too, that here a separation is spoken of, while the *Sheol* doctrine knew no such separation. Now, the Psalmist frequently uses *Sheol*, figuratively, as a place of punishment; and he says also, directly, that the wicked shall be turned

into it (*Sheol*). With the Psalmist, then, the abode of the wicked was not in a corner or abyss of *Sheol*, but in a place denoted by that term used in a figurative sense. He knew nothing of a Paradise, or Eden, connected with it. This, we have seen, was a creation of the rabbins, who came long after him. Where, then, did he place the congregation of the righteous? Why, just where the New Testament places them—in the presence of God and at his right hand, where are fullness of joy and pleasures forevermore. Every intelligent Bible-reader knows that the phrases, “presence of God,” and “right hand of God,” denote heaven; and, allowing that he used them figuratively, the figure is based on the idea of heaven as a place of happiness.

With the results now fairly and laboriously won, let us find the connecting link between the terms of the Old and the New Testaments. What prototypes are to be sought for the interpretation of the latter? It will be admitted as a *great truth*, by every able critic, that one grand object accomplished by the old dispensation was to impart certain ideas, and associate them with appropriate terms, as preparatory to a more clear, spiritual revelation. It was not enough that God should do this in the language of his chosen people, but, by his inscrutable providence, he caused the translation of the sacred oracles to be made into the very language in which he intended to make his higher and clearer revelation. Thus Old Testament terms become the prototypes of corresponding ones in the New Testament. Even admitting that the Septuagint version was solely the work of man, the result is the same. To show the force of this, and bring us at once to its application, take the tenth verse of the sixteenth Psalm, in which the word *Sheol* occurs. In the Septuagint, *Sheol*, in this and other passages, is rendered by Hades. In Acts ii. 27, where this passage is quoted, Hades must have the same meaning as in the Septuagint, and precisely the same meaning and usage as *Sheol* in the original. More than this, the phrase, “thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades,” is synonymous with “thou wilt not leave my soul in *Sheol*.” As this is the chief passage on which the Hadeistical interpreters depend, let us examine closely and candidly into the meaning of the latter phrase. All admit

that it teaches, impliedly, deliverance from *Sheol*. Now, there are two ways in which deliverance may be spoken of: first, as *preventing* from; second, by delivering from, after one is in the power of any thing. According to the first mode of speaking, the Psalmist says, in Ps. lvi. 13: "For thou hast delivered my soul from the hand [power] of *Sheol*." As he had neither died nor been raised up, "delivered" must be synonymous with *prevented from*. He simply means, then, that God had kept him from death. It is plain, also, that *Sheol* is used in a highly figurative sense. Again, "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of *Sheol*?" This passage furnishes its own explanation. In Ps. xlix. 15, the Psalmist uses the same phrase with reference to the resurrection of his body, or deliverance from the hand of *Sheol*. He says: "But God will redeem [deliver, the same word as above] my soul from the hand of *Sheol*; for he shall receive me." The reasons for believing so are these: There is nothing in the language or the context to forbid this idea. On the other hand, the context seems to demand it. He is contrasting his lot with that of the wicked. He carries their lot into eternity. (See verses 8, 12, 19.) The contrast is not complete, if we suppose the Psalmist to refer to temporal deliverance only. The expression, "receive me," may be translated *take me to himself*, the same word being used here as when it is said of Enoch, "the Lord took him" [to himself]. The word bears this meaning frequently. Whether these reasons be sufficient or not, it is still plain that *Sheol*, in all these passages, is not used in its literal, but in a figurative, sense. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *Sheol*," therefore, is a figurative expression synonymous with, "Thou wilt not leave me subject to death," implying that he would be subject to it for awhile, but would be delivered. As this deliverance was to come shortly after death, it is added: "Neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." The first phrase expresses, or rather implies, the resurrection of the dead; the second, that it will take place before corruption ensues, and, therefore, speedily. The latter clause teaches, impliedly, the resurrection; yet it would not have been added but for the fact that it adds the thought of speediness. We may para-

phrase thus, and retain the exact idea of the whole: "Thou wilt not leave me under the power of death until my body decays." This exposition is submitted to the test of the best scholarship as being candid, fair, and conclusive. There is, then, in this passage, not the shadow of evidence of an intermediate state, nor that Hades denotes an intermediate place of the dead. Nothing but the strong alchemy of false interpretation can extract such a meaning from it. The crucible-test of sound interpretation exposes the dark process, and consumes the implements of the false alchemists.

It was designed to examine a number of other passages, supposed to teach the doctrine, but it has been thought best to invite the reader's attention to principles which will sweep away the whole class of interpretations. The interpreters base all their interpretations on this assumption, viz., that, when Hades is spoken of in the New Testament, it is used in accordance with the prevailing Greco-Hebrew mythology of the times. This cannot very easily be proved, but it can be shown that, in every passage where it occurs in the New Testament, *Sheol* can be found in the Old Testament Hebrew, and Hades in the Septuagint, with precisely the same *usus loquendi*. This proves their assumption to be false; for it is a historic fact that it was not until after the closing of the Old Testament canon that the Hebrews adopted the Greek refinements of Hades; and, as it conforms to the use of *Sheol* strictly in the Old Testament, it is a contradiction to say it conforms to later Greek or Hebrew use. We have seen what the meanings of *Sheol* and Hades are in the Old Testament. To examine particular passages in the New Testament, would carry us over precisely the same ground.

It is also a barefaced assumption that, in Scripture usage, Gehenna is regarded as a part of Hades. That the Jews and rabbins so regarded it, we do not deny. What we deny is, that Inspiration so connected the terms. The most superficial Bible-student knows something of the history of the term Gehenna. It originally denoted a valley south-east of Jerusalem, in which the Jews frequently fell into the practice of idolatrous rites. For this reason it was polluted and rendered execrable by Josiah. After this, the filth of the city

and dead carcasses of animals and malefactors were cast into it; to prevent the stench of which, fires were kept continually burning in different parts of it. And, as God's judgments were signal against the Jews for defections in this place, its name was used figuratively to express his threats of severe chastisement. In reference to the perpetual fires in the place, it is called "Gehenna of fire," which is the same in the Hebrew idiom as fiery Gehenna in ours. According to Gesenius, it was called Tophet, in reference to the ignominiousness in which the place was held, this term being derived from one which means to spit upon in contempt. Not one of these names is used in the Old Testament in reference to future punishment, nor is it associated with *Sheol*. Where "Gehenna of fire," translated hell-fire, first occurs in the New Testament, (Matt. v. 22,) it is used, as in the Old Testament, to denote the severest temporal punishment. Most generally, however, the context shows that the reference is to future punishment. In this sense it is synonymous with *Sheol*, used figuratively for the abode of the wicked, and with Hades, used in the same sense, to translate *Sheol*.

Hades, in Rev. xx. 14, is represented as being thrown into the lake of fire, or Gehenna. Interpreted literally, it seems to favor strongly the theory of an intermediate state. But, confessedly, the whole passage is highly figurative, in which Hades denotes the place of the dead bodies of men, and not the abode of their souls. This is evident from the fact that the dead are said to be in it in the same sense in which they are in the sea. The language is the same in the one case as in the other, with no indication of a difference of signification. If the dead, in death and Hades, do not denote the dead on the land, there is nothing in the passage to represent these. But, what is most conclusive, Hades is coupled with death by a coördinate conjunction; and, as death is self-evidently used in a figurative sense, Hades must be; for literal and figurative language cannot, in the nature of things, be coördinate. It is neither said nor intimated that a part of Hades is cast into the lake of fire, nor that the lake is a part of Hades; but the language plainly is based on the idea that all of Hades is cast therein. The three terms, then, are used in a figurative, subordinate way,

to express the thought that all the dead bodies of men are to be surrendered up from their resting-places as completely as if the dominions of death were themselves destroyed. In chap. xxi. 8, we learn that *persons*, not *places*, are to be cast into the "lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, it is *supposed* that reference is made to the division of the place according to the Jewish notions. At most, this can only be inferred. But does the language warrant the inference? It is nowhere found, in the *usus loquendi* of Scripture, that Abraham's bosom denotes the lower paradise of the rabbins. The rich man saw Abraham *afar off*, with a great gulf intervening. But the rabbins held that the abodes of the blessed and the wicked are separated by only a hair's breadth. There is no intimation, either in the language of Abraham or that of Dives, that their abodes and conditions were temporary. It is, therefore, plain that these interpreters put the Hades doctrine into this passage instead of deducing it therefrom. Hades here, as frequently in the Septuagint, denotes figuratively a place of punishment. Dives was in torments. Why go to heathen mythology for a meaning for the term when Inspiration has already settled it? With this meaning, it cannot be denied, the interpretation is consistent with itself and with all other parts of the sacred record. Again, it is held by the advocates of this doctrine, that Hades is never used as synonymous with Gehenna. Let us see if the position is sustained by facts. By the admission of all, Gehenna is used figuratively to denote a place of future punishment. Does Hades ever have this meaning? It has been seen that, in innumerable passages in the Septuagint, it must have this meaning, in order to convey the signification of *Sheol*. In the last passage, it was shown, at least, that this meaning of Hades satisfies the text and context as well as any other, and that it undoubtedly denotes a place of torment in the midst of flames, such as parch the tongue. This is admitted, as it must be; but, it is said, it does not here mean a place of final and eternal torment. What evidence is there of this? Is there any thing in the passage itself which directly declares that the torments of Hades would ever give way to worse flames? No one says

there is. Is there any thing from which it may be inferred? Confessedly nothing, unless we *assume* that Hades is an intermediate and temporary place of torment. But this is just the point to be proved; and, as it cannot be done from this text, without reasoning in a circle, proof must be looked for elsewhere. Having, then, wrenched their ill-gotten weapon from the hands of the champions of the theory, let us use it still farther against them. Do not the flames and torments of Hades, here spoken of, suggest most naturally the "lake of fire," the Gehenna of fire, "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched"? The grounds for inference are most plainly against them. Again, they infer the intermediate place and state, because, after the resurrection and judgment, the wicked are never represented as going into Hades, but into Gehenna. We grant this to be the fact; but is it of such a character as to warrant their conclusion? Or, to put the subject in its true light, is the fact best explained by their supposition, or by some other supposition, or by historic facts in the case? The statement in this article is held to be correct; and the most that the advocates of the theory in question can claim is a bare supposition. No attempt will be made here to explain on the strength of mere suppositions, but on the soundest principles of linguistic science in connection with historic facts. The simple fact to be accounted for is, that one term displaces another with which it is synonymous. The benefit is here claimed of the previous reasoning by which it was shown that the terms in question are synonymous as denoting a place of future and eternal torments. Now, the law by which synonymous terms displace each other is this: The more definite, distinct, and unambiguous, displace the more general, obscure, and ambiguous. The reason of this law is apparent to all, and would have as full force with the all-wise God as with man. It is based on a desire to be understood.

That Hades is the word to be displaced, according to the foregoing law, is evident from the history of the words as already given. Besides its false literal meaning, it is used figuratively in four or five different ways. It is most general, from its very nature, being applicable to any hollow, cavernous place. Gehenna is definite and specific in its origin, and

in its figurative meanings unambiguous, always referring to a place of punishment, either temporal or eternal, as the context never fails to indicate. It has connected with it no Jewish nor heathen notions of *Elysium*. Suppose, now, that it is represented to be said at the judgment, Depart into *Sheol* or Hades. Of course the rabbins and all will be familiar with the phrase, Go down to *Sheol* or Hades. It means, Go under the power of death. The fair inference will be that, after the resurrection and judgment, the bodies of the wicked will decay again and their souls dwell forever in a gloomy state. No groundless supposition is here made. Every one can see that, in Divine revelation, we need something more definite than the term Hades and its *usus loquendi*, to express the awful realities of the dark world of eternal woe. We expect it in the book in which not only life and immortality, but the second death, are brought to light. How ambiguous would be the expressions, "Destroy both soul and body into Hades," "Having two eyes to be cast into Hades," and others which may be formed by substituting Hades for Gehenna!

The same law, with the same result, had its force with language used in reference to the abode of the righteous. The term heaven is put prominently forward instead of its synonyms and periphrases, these latter being used more sparingly. "Paradise" is used but three times, in two of which the context explains it to be the "third heaven," the Paradise of God, the celestial Paradise, in the midst of which is the tree of life. In the other passage in which Christ says to the penitent thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," there is nothing in the context to indicate that it has a different meaning from what has just been given, unless we first suppose that there is an intermediate Hades with its Paradise. The Scriptures nowhere sanction this supposition. The weight, then, is as two to nothing against finding it in this passage. When an author twice defines his terms, they are to be so taken as he defines them, unless the context plainly demands something else. But Paradise is not often used, because in the minds of men it is ambiguous. All claim clearer light in the New Testament than in the Old. How could this be effected without using clearer expressions? The fact not only fails to sustain

the foregoing supposition, but it turns against the whole theory with which that supposition is connected.

The length of this article already requires that it be brought to a close. There has been brought forward no great array of authorities from commentators, because correct fundamental principle is of greater weight than the authority of them all, the Jewish doctors included. False interpretation of Scripture, based on false principles of hermeneutics, led to the rejection of the Prince of Life, and to-day forms the thickest part of the veil over the mind of the Jew, when Moses is read. Their error is of precisely the same nature as that of those interpreters who deduce the doctrine of Hades from Holy Writ. Both substitute the traditions of men for the plain word of God, as the basis of interpretation. Both have an incorrect prototype—the one a temporal prince, the other a literal Hades, as the source of their errors. Greater learning, connected with fundamental error, is only made more fruitful of error by its own increased activities and application. What the results of this article may be, must be left with the candid reader to judge. There are many features of the doctrine in question which have not here been noticed; many passages, too, not herein alluded to, which are adduced in support of the doctrine; but, if the position taken in the present article be tenable, they all fall with the main superstructure, whose foundation is in error.

ART. V.—*The Calls of God.*

As skepticism upon the subject of a call to the ministry is prevalent, and daily gathering strength and confidence, it may be proper to review the whole subject of the calls of God.

He called Noah to the construction of the ark, and qualified him for the work. When we consider that the ark was doubtless the first water craft that was constructed, and then take into the account its huge dimensions, considering therewith the complication of the structure, we shall perceive the propriety of a call, and the necessity of the Divine supervision. The

ark, according to the shortest estimate of the cubit, was at least four hundred and fifty feet in length, seventy-five in width, and forty-five in height, with three stories, and an endless complication of rooms and compartments. As well select a Comanche to build a steam-boat, as Noah to construct such a vessel, without the Divine superintendence. Not only was Noah called, but qualified, for the great work by the instructions of the all-wise God. What a call was that which saved the races of man, beast, and bird!

Abraham was called of God to leave his country—Babylonia—and his kindred, and go into a “land that I will show thee.” And he went out, not knowing whither he was going. God led him, by the way of Damascus, into Canaan, and gave him that goodly land. By thus removing him from the growing corruption and idolatry of Babylon, he became the “father of the faithful,” and the founder of a great nation.

God appeared unto Moses in the “burning bush,” and called and commissioned him to lead “the children of Israel out of the land of bondage.” Through him God wrought the most astonishing miracles to constrain the Egyptians to let Israel go free. And when they came out, God led them by a “pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night.” When pursued by the Egyptians, and all retreat was cut off, God opened up a road through the “midst of the sea,” and fed them in the wilderness with “bread from heaven.” They were led to Sinai, and there Moses was called up to its fiery summit. There, amid the flame, and smoke, and thunder, he received the moral law, the basis of all morality, and thus established the true religion.

Aaron was divinely called to the construction of the tabernacle, with all its furniture, and was constituted the high-priest of Israel. God called Joshua to be the commander of the host of Israel, and led him from Sinai to Canaan by a “pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night,” and fed him and the whole host of Israel, on “bread from heaven.” When Joshua reached the Jordan, though it had overflowed its banks, he led the host across the stream “on dry ground,” the water standing up like a wall on either hand. This miracle struck terror to the hearts of the Canaanites. When

the Israelites had crossed the river, God called Joshua to the capture of Jericho. With huge stones it was "walled up to heaven;" but, by the blowing of "the seven trumpets of rams' horns," the walls miraculously fell.

God called David to head the host of Israel, and drive the heathen tribes out of Canaan. He conquered the whole land from Egypt to Sidon, and from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates; and thus he established the kingdom. Solomon was called to build the temple; and, notwithstanding he was the wisest man of his day, God gave him special instructions as to the plan of the building, with its various compartments, its furniture, and the manner of adorning the whole and each part. When completed, it was doubtless the most splendid structure on the earth. But its glory was the sacred *Shekinah* whose glory radiated the holy of holies.

God called the prophets, of whom Elijah was chief, whom he sent to rebuke Ahab who introduced in Israel the worship of Baal. And Elijah said: "As the Lord God of Israel liveth, there shall not be dew or rain these three years, but according to my word." A drought of three years ensued, and parched the land, till Ahab was so humbled that he sent for Elijah to come and pray for rain. He came, and ordered the priests of Baal to be assembled. Four hundred came, and he proposed that they should prepare a sacrifice to Baal, while he would prepare one to Jehovah. They were to call upon Baal to send down fire from heaven to consume their sacrifice, but he was to call upon Jehovah; and the God that should answer by fire should be recognized as the true God. So the priests of Baal prepared their sacrifice, and called upon him from morning till the time of the evening sacrifice; but no answer came from Baal. "Then Elijah called upon Jehovah, and the fire of the Lord came down from heaven and consumed his sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water in the trenches." And when the people saw it, they said, "The Lord, he is the God." Then Elijah went to the top of Mount Carmel, and prayed till a cloud, the size of a man's hand, rose from the sea; when he ceased praying, and ordered the people to prepare for a great rain. "And it came to pass that the heaven was black with

clouds and wind, and there was a great rain." "And Elijah said unto the people: Take the prophets of Baal—let not one of them escape. And they took them, and Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon and slew them there." After Elijah had witnessed for God, and finished the work assigned him, as he and his successor, Elisha, walked together, "Behold there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." And Elisha took up the mantle that fell from Elijah, and smote the waters of the Jordan, "and they parted hither and thither, and he passed over on dry ground." Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the minor prophets, were all called of God; and each, in his day, warned transgressors of the evil to come, and urged them to repentance. But they went on in their evil way, taking no thought for the future, till the threatened judgments came, and hurried them away in their sins. Such has ever been the course of sinners, and such it is to-day.

Had the Jews studied the prophets half as diligently as they "tithed mint and cummin," they would have understood them, and would not have incurred the guilt of having crucified the "Lord of Glory." But the eyes of their understanding were blinded by prejudice and bigotry; and God gave them up "to blindness of mind and hardness of heart." The apostles were called, not excepting Judas who was attracted by the "loaves and fishes" and what was in the "bag." The least objectionable trait of his character was that he felt compunction enough to go out and hang himself! The eleven were called, not only to be disciples and witnesses for Jesus, but to go forth and proclaim him as the Messiah, and to urge sinners to faith in him as the only Saviour. The four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, were called to make a record of what they had seen and heard, that those who had not enjoyed their distinguished privileges might believe and be saved. The vacancy caused by the apostasy of Judas was filled "by casting lots," and praying that the Lord would show whom he had chosen. "And the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven." "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all, with one accord,

in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

"And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Now, when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language. And they were all amazed, and marveled, saying one to another, Behold, are not these men which speak Galileans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?" "But Peter, standing up with the eleven, said: Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you: for these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel: I will pour out, in those days, of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy; and I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath." "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, which ye have crucified, both Lord and Saviour." "When they heard this they were pricked to the heart, and said: Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Then Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto the Church three thousand souls."

Peter and John went up to the temple to pray, and a lame man that "never had walked" asked alms. Peter said: "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I unto thee. In the name of Jesus Christ, rise up and walk." "And he, leaping up, stood, and walked, and entered into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God."

The multitude assembled to see the wonder. Peter preached Christ, and "five thousand" were converted! This "notable

miracle" greatly troubled the Pharisees, but they "could not deny it; so they let them go," and they went forth, preaching Christ, and other thousands believed, and were added to the Church. "After this, a multitude came, bringing sick folks, and them that were vexed with unclean spirits, and they were healed, every one." Then the priests laid hands upon the apostles, and put them in prison. But the angel of the Lord opened the doors of the prison, and brought them forth, and said, "Go, stand and preach in the temple all the words of this life." And the next morning they went into the temple and "taught the people." In the meantime the high-priest assembled the Senate, and sent for the prisoners; but the officer could not find them, though the prison door was closed. The council were amazed, but one came and said: "The men whom ye put in prison are standing in the temple, and teaching the people." Then they sent to the temple and had them brought before the council, and said: "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name?" Peter responded: "We ought to obey God rather than men." Then he preached Christ to the Senate, and avowed himself a disciple. Then Gamaliel gave the Senate some good counsel, advising that they should not take any action in the case—"for if this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it. And to him they agreed; and when they had called the apostles, and beaten them, they let them go." "And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ." "And the word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem daily, and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." "And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people. And when they were not able to resist the wisdom and power with which he spake, then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God." Then they arrested Stephen, and introduced "false witnesses" who testified that he spake "blasphemous words against Moses and against God." "And all they that sat in the council, looking steadfastly upon him, saw his face, as it had been the face

of an angel." The high-priest asked whether the charges were true. Then he made his defense; and, "looking steadfastly up into heaven, he said: I see the heavens open, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God"! Then they cast him out of the city and stoned him; and the witnesses laid down their clothes at the feet of a young man whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." "And Saul was consenting unto his death." The murderous death of Stephen was followed by a general persecution at Jerusalem, and the disciples were scattered abroad; but wherever they went, they preached Christ "and him crucified." And thousands believed, and were added unto the Church. So the persecution aided the propagation of the gospel.

The disciples, who fled to Damascus, preached Christ as the Messiah, and many of the Jews residing there believed, and were associated with the Jews that fled from the persecution raging at Jerusalem. "And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high-priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that, if he should find any of this way, [any Christian,] whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." "And as he journeyed, he came near to Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven; and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." And the men that journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. "And Saul arose from the earth, and, when his eyes were opened, he saw no man; but they led him by the hand, and brought him to Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus named Ananias. To him said the Lord in a vision, Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one

called Saul, of Tarsus; for behold, he prayeth, and hath seen, in a vision, a man called Ananias, coming in and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight."

Then Ananias said: "Lord, I have heard of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call upon thy name. But the Lord said unto him: Go thy way; for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel. For I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake." Ananias then went to him, and, laying his hand upon him, said: "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." "And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God."

When Paul returned to Jerusalem, he sought fellowship with the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, till Barnabas informed them of his vision on his way to Damascus, and that he had preached Christ in Damascus. Then they received him into fellowship, and he forthwith preached Christ in the temple, and confounded Jews and Gentiles. The Jews were so enraged, now that their champion attacked their faith with arguments that they could not answer, that they sought to slay him. But Paul's friends conveyed him to Cæsarea, and from thence they sent him to Tarsus, where he preached Christ with great power. Subsequently, Barnabas brought him to Antioch, where he labored with great success for a whole year. "And the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch." There were other "prophets and teachers at Antioch;" and while they were fasting and praying, "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Then the brethren fasted and prayed, and laying their hands upon Saul and Barnabas, they ordained them as missionaries, and sent them to the Gentiles. "So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia;" and, after laboring there awhile, they

visited Cyprus and Salamis, and "preached the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews." Thenceforth Paul became the "light of the Gentiles," and visited all the principal cities of Asia Minor and South-eastern Europe, preaching with great power, and converting thousands to the worship of the living God. His speech before King Agrippa is one of the finest specimens of oratory in the language.

As in all ages, and under every dispensation, God has selected, called, and commissioned his agents to execute his will, and to publish his mandates; so, under the gospel dispensation, he has reserved to himself the prerogative of selecting his own ambassadors and heralds of the cross. "No man taketh this honor to himself, except he be called of God as Aaron was"—as Noah, Abraham, Moses, and all the prophets and apostles were. Even so must the ministers of Christ, in every age, and under every administration, be called of God. But how are they called? Not by the audible voice of God, in familiar converse, as when he called Noah and Abraham. Not by a theophany, as when God appeared unto Moses in the burning bush, and the "pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night." Not as he came down on Sinai "in flaming fire," attended with "thunder and lightning." Not by any visible manifestation of the Divine glory; but by impressions made by his Spirit upon the mind and heart of him whom he calls to the ministry.

God calls every sinner to repentance, and the call is so distinct, so impressive, so convincing and unmistakable, that the sinner writhes under it, and groans in bitterness and agony of soul. And if one attempts to persuade him that it is a delusion—a creation of the imagination—he will turn away from such counsel with horror and detestation. God calls every penitent to faith in Christ, and though he may be exceedingly slow to believe, yet when he can be brought to a calm consideration of the character of the Saviour, and the exceeding great and precious promises of the gospel, he finds his heart spontaneously yielding, trusting and confiding in the Saviour.

Now if a sensual and benighted sinner can thus be called to faith in Christ, and be induced to set his affections upon the immaculate Saviour, and yearn to be like him in holiness;

and if this wonderful transformation can be effected by the silent operations of the Spirit, surely that same Spirit which has quietly wrought such a transformation of the heart, can lead the enlightened and renovated mind to an apprehension of duty. Does this conclusion imply any thing more miraculous or mysterious than the conversion of a sinner? Is not the one as comprehensible as the other? Do we recognize regeneration as a blessed reality, and rest our hope of heaven upon it? Then why not recognize the voice of God in our hearts, calling us to the ministry? The truth is, these are cognate doctrines, and they who reject the one are bound to reject the other, if they would be consistent. They who hold that regeneration is wrought by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, should have no difficulty in recognizing the agency of the Spirit in a call to the ministry. They who hold that regeneration is simply a change of the *purpose* of the mind, followed by a reformation in morals, are bound to exclude the agency of the Holy Spirit.

A call to the ministry is not, therefore, more mysterious or incomprehensible than a call to repentance; and the one is as imperative as the other. We may resist either. No one is compelled to trust in Christ and become a Christian; but if he refuse or neglect, he will lose heaven. No Christian is compelled to preach the gospel, nor would he forfeit salvation if he should refuse; for that does not depend upon obedience to a call to the ministry. But he will forfeit the reward he might have gained by obedience. But if, when called to the ministry, he refuses, he will walk in darkness, with no satisfactory evidence of his acceptance, or assurance of salvation. If, however, he obey the call, he will have, not only the consolations of the gospel in this life, but stars in his crown of rejoicing in the life to come. He will lay up treasure in heaven and win souls to Christ, to participate with him in the enjoyments of heaven. The highest honor God can confer upon man in this life is to call him to the ministry, and make him instrumental in winning many souls to Christ. Who, of all the great men of the world, can stand beside Paul? Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Cæsar, Napoleon, and Washington, are all eclipsed by the majesty of the prince of the apostles.

Though the world may never be honored with another Paul, yet there are thousands of living ministers to-day who, we trust, have been called of God as Moses, Elijah, and Paul were; and though none may rival these, yet they may be inspired to aim high.

Do ministers in this day really believe in their hearts that they are called of God? Are they impressed with that solemn truth when they are in the pulpit, and stand up before the congregation to preach Christ crucified for the sins of the race? Do they believe the promise of the Saviour to be with them, even to the end of the world? Do they expect and realize his presence? Was it to secure such preaching as we frequently have that he bore the agony of the cross? Did Elijah, Isaiah, or Paul ever preach after the manner of the pulpit of this day? Will the world ever be converted under such preaching? These are serious inquiries. May they be prayerfully considered! May the tone of the pulpit become more earnest, more pungent, more constraining, more subduing!

ART. VI.—*The Spiritual Faculty.*

Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. (1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.)

WE are equipped with senses and faculties suited to our present mode of existence. We are material in our bodily structure; we perceive material objects and relations. *The senses* are the channels through which knowledge of the outside world flows inward upon the soul. The eye carries to the mind an impression of the thousand tints of light and shade. The ear gives the soul notice of the vibrations which we call sound; it startles with the peals of thunder, or is lulled and delighted with the melody of music. In the text, the ear and the eye stand as the representatives of the other senses. These unite to furnish us with a complete knowledge of the

objects about us. Then the mind works up the materials, furnished by the senses, into a thousand new and fantastic shapes. The painter combines the beauty of a hundred objects in one masterpiece. The musical composer blends a thousand voices of bird, and insect, and sighing wind, and whispering forest, with the solemn murmur of ocean, and we are subdued by the melting harmony. Myriad scenes and shapes of beauty and horror are strangely woven into our sleeping and waking dreams. Imagination can put all the glorious things we ever saw into one object, and make it transcendently glorious. Pictures float before the mind that can never be seen with outward eyes. Poetry and fiction are the glittering fabrics woven by the imagination; the unreal woven out of the real, or the real purged of its grosser parts; the dazzling, airy imagings of the heart of man.

The scripture which we are to discuss tells us that the things which God has prepared for those that love him are not only beyond the reach of the bodily senses—hearing and sight—but beyond the circle of thought and imagination. These wonderful things have not even entered into the heart of man. The central principle insisted on in this language, and in the entire chapter in which it stands, is, *that we cannot get a proper conception of religious truth through the ordinary methods of sensation and thought, but that it must be revealed by the awakening and growth of the spiritual faculty.* Eye cannot see it, nor ear hear it, nor can thought or imagination picture it. Only the Spirit can search the deep things of God.

This doctrine is taught, in one form or another, in almost every chapter of the New Testament. Christ's kingdom is not of this world. We cannot enter it till we are born from above. All attempts to reach spiritual knowledge, through material sense and human reason, must, in the very nature of things, prove failures. "For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God."

In olden times, the tendency was to try to bring religion down to the compass of sense. Men wanted gods that could be seen and handled. They wanted visible and audible manifestations. They were on the watch for some strange sight;

they bent their ears to catch some supernatural sound. The mass of men were idolaters. They believed in a material heaven, where the gods ate, and drank, and fought. Sensual delights were to be the future reward of the good. Eye had seen the best things these idolatrous systems promised; ear had heard them; the conception of them had entered the heart. And even those who had some glimpses of the truth were not above the need of outward wonders. They demanded something within the reach of sense. And this is why God, who ever grants his children what they need, condescended to work miracles. The four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal, before the assembled Israelites, demanded something that eye could see and ear hear, when God sent down fire to consume the sacrifice in answer to Elijah's prayer. (1 Kings xviii.)

But in enlightened lands, at least, the reign of gross idolatry has passed away. There is, however, a modern school of philosophy that refuses to credit any thing that cannot be demonstrated by sensible tests. It is the philosophy of fact and of human reason. It holds that no truth is higher than eye can see, or ear hear, or reason weave out of the materials furnished by the senses. All outside of this is myth and shadow.

This fact—philosophy, or positivism—is the wisdom of this world. It may be a safe system when applied to material things, but an element enters Christianity which it does not acknowledge. It may be a good system to crawl through the earth with, but it has no wings to mount heavenward. It acknowledges but five avenues by which knowledge can reach the soul—the bodily senses; and holds that what we think to be inward impressions are only the echoes and reverberations produced by outward things striking the senses. Christianity claims that there is an inward faculty which is more or less sensitive to the touch of spirit; which hears more or less faintly the voice of God. All other faculties and powers ought to be the servants of this spiritual faculty—ought to become its tributaries, and do its bidding. The claim that Christianity has always adhered to is, that it imparts knowledge beyond the reach of unaided sense and thought. To say that we have

no avenues of knowledge except the senses, and that these reveal no God and no hope of a future life, and that there is, therefore, no such Being or hope, is a glaring fallacy. It is taking for granted the very thing to be proved. The fact that the physical senses are the only sources of knowledge, must first be established. The very chapter which we are discussing, written centuries before positivism had a name, insists that the truths of Christianity are above sense and above thought—that the Spirit must reveal the deep things of God.

All admit the validity of the knowledge obtained through carnal sense. We all perceive the light; sounds strike all our ears; all acknowledge the presence of certain odors and flavors, of certain sensations of touch. But when we pass beyond the senses, this agreement ceases. On the day of Pentecost, when the spiritual faculty was rendered uncommonly active in many, those who did not have its powers awakened, thought the others intoxicated. "They are full of new wine," said they. Nothing struck them as capable of creating such commotion. They heard no sound; they saw no light. It was foolishness. And why was it foolishness? Because the things of the Spirit must be spiritually discerned; because eye cannot see, nor ear hear, the deep things of God; because the hearts of some were blind.

Is it incredible that new powers of soul are developed in those who give their hearts to Christ? Is it absurd to hold that there are possibilities of limitless spiritual development in every breast? Animals are developed from a lower to a higher life; new powers and new faculties are given them. Worms take wings. An inert egg is brooded over by a bird, and presently a living creature bursts forth from its shell. Is it impossible that the capacity for a higher life dwells in the human soul? Is it absurd to say that the loving wings of God's Spirit may develop this capacity by imparting new life? Can even the doubter behold the meanness and misery of this outward life without sighing for something better? And must we sigh in vain?

Whether such new spiritual life is enkindled in any soul or not, is not a question of reason, but of fact. It is not absurd to say that new life is bestowed and the spiritual faculty de-

veloped. Are there any instances of the bestowal of such new life? The answer to this question must decide the whole matter. In the very nature of things, this decision depends on human testimony. Human testimony must decide all questions of consciousness; and this becomes a question of consciousness. It is just like the question whether any one destitute of the sense of smell has been restored. To establish this fact, we must find some one who will testify that he has been destitute of this sense, and is now conscious that he possesses it. He says he now perceives a difference between the odor of a poppy and the odor of a rose. The truth of this is purely a matter of human testimony. We cannot judge another's consciousness or perceptions. If one declares that he feels a new and peculiar sensation of pleasure or pain, another has no right to set aside his testimony because he himself never felt a similar sensation. The blind man has no right to say the sun does not shine because its light does not affect his eyes.

Now there are hundreds of thousands of men and women who testify, in the most earnest and solemn manner, that they have experienced the beginning and progress of a new life in their souls. Multitudes have adhered to this testimony in the very face of persecution and death. Are not these persons better judges of their own consciousness than others who, by their own admission, know nothing at all about the matter? There are instances of blind people having been restored to sight, and the fact cannot be doubted, for there are a few people, perhaps two in every ten millions, who have been cured of blindness by modern surgery. We have the testimony of the cured. They say they see, and act as if they saw; and we believe them. It all rests on human testimony. But when I tell you that there are persons whom God has blessed with spiritual sight, new and glorious, by which they get a more joyous view of the beauty of God, you will not believe me. I summon ten thousand witnesses whom you would believe in any other matter, and who, in the most trying circumstances, *act as if their testimony were true*, and still you doubt; yet the restoration of spiritual sight has ten thousand witnesses to prove its genuineness where the other has but one.

Here we are met with an objection. The material senses are universal. Everybody sees, and feels, and hears, or those who do not are rare exceptions. But this spiritual faculty is exceptional. Only a part of the human family possesses it. This, we are told, contradicts the analogy of nature. Nature deals with all alike—is no respecter of persons. Hence it is a delusion to say one possesses power to discuss spiritual things, and another is destitute of this power.

This objection arises from a misapprehension of a very important matter. Every man, by nature, is a spiritual being—has the faculty of receiving spiritual impressions. “The germ is overborne, not annihilated.”* The fallen state of man is not a state of spiritual insensibility or death, so as to unfit the soul to receive impressions from God, but it is a state of spiritual distortion—a state of guilt and fear. We perceive God and dread his presence. He troubles us; his beauty and love are distorted and fearful. The photographer prepares a plate that is sensitive to light. If the instrument is out of order, the image that is formed on this plate is unnatural and distorted. So we are sensitive to the impressions of God’s Spirit. When our souls are turned toward God, made dreadful by our guilt and fear, we flee from him. But God reveals himself in a lovely form on which any one may look. It is the form of Christ. If we can gaze at his gentle compassion, his loving kindness and mercy, and realize that this is God, his image is impressed on the soul, and love and trust take the place of terror. Every one may thus look and trust; but we may banish the beautiful presence, and look through the distorted medium of guilt, and thus make the image of God more and more terrible.

Were the spiritual faculty bestowed arbitrarily on some and withheld from others, the objection above alluded to would possess much force. But the same book that teaches that we must be born of the Spirit, also teaches that this spiritual birth is in the reach of every human being. “If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to

* Vinet’s *Homiletics*, p. 204.

them that ask him?" (Matt. vii. 11.) The whole tenor of the New Testament is, that all are invited, that all may know and love Christ if they will. "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 Peter iii. 9.) There is no partiality, no inequality, in this doctrine of spiritual birth. All are on the same footing; any man may receive it or reject it. It then becomes an important question: How shall we get this beginning of spiritual life in the soul? By what door may we enter this new kingdom?

Suppose one wishes to learn the Greek language. This is a new world of literature. Can he ever enter it by studying English books? No; he must learn the Greek letters first. These are the key to the words; and, with their aid, he grows in the new circle of knowledge. To one unacquainted with Greek characters, all the pages of printed thought are foolishness. To the learner, page after page grows intelligible; but without a knowledge of the new alphabet, he could never understand a word. Now Christ is the alphabet of spiritual knowledge; to every soul he is a new and living way. Hence Paul determined to know nothing among the Corinthians but Christ. They were beginners, and Jesus was the starting-point. Not that they did not possess a spiritual faculty before, but it was disordered; the spiritual vision was distorted. Christ wins the love of those who flee to him, and they are brought into sympathy with God. The distorted spiritual faculties are restored to their normal condition of harmonious life. Christ is the only door to this new life, and love to him the only stairway of spiritual progress. We can learn nothing till we learn Christ. When we love him—and he is gentler than a brother—we have the Spirit of God, and this is the key to all the unrevealed and unimagined glories that await the faithful. Love is the easy condition. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."

It can never be too much impressed upon the mind, that Christ is the only way to spiritual peace. When we learn to love Christ, we are born again; the warring elements of the

soul have found peace. Before, we have no sympathy with spiritual beauty. It is like a lovely picture to one whose vision is imperfect. It is out of our world. Have you not looked out on the face of nature—on the hills and beautiful forests, and upward to the calm sky—in hours when the heart was hot with grief, and thought all their beauty gone? Ah! what beauty is there in tree, or brook, or sky, to a soul wrestling with sorrow, “too deep for sympathy or cure”—wrestling, but not yet resigned? But in calmer hours the same music of brook or beauty of landscape holds the soul in delightful enchantment. And the soul, under the sway of passion and lust, is blind to the beauty of God. The carnal mind is enmity against God. But when the calm hour of faith and trust comes on, when the weary soul rests on the bosom of Christ, then the same God that used to frighten is covered with beauty, and the soul is enraptured as it gazes. “The natural man receiveth not the things of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” These things grow lovely when the spiritual are harmonized and inspired with new life by the operations of the Holy Ghost.

There is nothing in the fact of spiritual birth that has not a parallel in ordinary human experience. New loves are awakened in every breast. The young mother will tell you that there is something in her love for her child unlike all she ever knew before. It may seem foolishness to those who never had a like love, that she should find her chief delight in watching the infant sleeper; but, to her, there is no music so sweet as its soft breath, as the infant head is pillowed on her bosom. Her soul is initiated into a new realm of love. But the soul that embraces Jesus has found a sweeter joy, a more enduring love.

The mother's love for her child does not destroy affections that existed before; her brothers and sisters are as dear as ever; she never knew so well how to love her father and mother. Every other love is rendered more precious. Nor does the love of Christ cut us loose from earthly affections and duties: it purifies the soul. It turns cursing into blessing, and hate into love. Earthly possessions and worldly knowl-

edge are sanctified by this spiritual birth. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." He has reached the highest kind of knowledge; and no one who has not attained this spiritual fellowship with God, can judge his motives or feelings. The first dawning of spiritual life assures us that the end is infinitely glorious. It is past comprehension; yet faith reveals enough of it to fill the heart with inexpressible gladness.

We know little of the nature of the rest and the glory that await us beyond the grave, yet we know that no bitterness will ever break in upon our eternal peace. We shall enjoy the perpetual content of gratified love—no death of loved ones to make our hearts sick; no tears but the tears of grateful joy; no crying, no pain. We know not fully what will be the *cause* of our unending bliss. Deliverance from sorrow and death will be one cause. The companionship of Jesus and the holy dead will be another. But heart cannot guess what other wonderful fountains of joy will be opened to the liberated soul. God's own hand will wipe all tears from our eyes.

We know not what will be our employments. We cannot guess at all the wonderful lessons we shall learn. We cannot tell to what unexplored regions of beauty and joy we may wing our flight. We only know that the Infinite encircles us everywhere, and that God promises a reward greater than heart can know.

We have a dim conception of the duration of our blessings. They are to endure forever. But we cannot tell unto what stature we shall grow. We shall be like Jesus, and see him as he is. But who can fathom the mystery of our eternal growth unto the image of God? Is not the reward bright enough? Will it not compensate ten thousand times for all the little sorrows of this short life? And all the world is invited to become partakers of this hope. Not one trusting soul will be excluded. "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."

ART. VII.—*History of Infant Baptism.*

IN the article on Infant Baptism, which appeared in the Theological Medium, of October, 1870, were presented the historical facts which confirm the position there assumed, namely, that the Church did, universally, practice the baptism of infants during the first four centuries of the Christian era. There is not a single writer of that period who testifies to the contrary. But Origen, St. Cyprian, St. Austin, and Pelagius, all state that it was the undisputed practice of the whole Church. Some of them state that it never was instituted by any council or assembly, but that it was in use from the time of the apostles. St. Austin and Pelagius both say that they had never heard of any man, nor had they ever read, in any book, of any one who ever denied this to have been the universal practice of the Church for three hundred years after the apostles. Pelagius says that he had never heard of any "wicked heretic" who denied it. The sum of it is, that they had no knowledge of any man, that lived between them and the apostles, who called it in question. The testimony of these writers upon this subject is a matter of no inconsiderable importance. St. Austin speaks of the baptism of infants as being the "firm faith of the Church" in the time of St. Cyprian, A.D. 250. Origen, born A.D. 185, speaks of the baptism of infants as being the "usage of the Church from the apostles." His birth was only eighty-five years after the death of the Apostle John. If these several writers were capable of bearing testimony to a matter of fact, then there was not the semblance of an anti-pedobaptist Church in their time. The period of time of which they had immediate knowledge embraced three centuries immediately after the apostles.

Dr. Philip Schaff, a celebrated German writer, in his history of the Christian Church, from A.D. 1-311, (pp. 401, 402,) says: "But, at the same time, it seems to us a settled fact, though by many disputed, that, with the baptism of converts, the optional baptism of the children of Christian parents, in established

congregations, comes down from the apostolic age. Among the fathers, Tertullian himself not excepted—for he combats only its expediency—there is not a single voice against the lawfulness and the apostolic origin of infant baptism. No time can be fixed at which it was first introduced. Tertullian suggests that it was usually founded on the invitation of Christ, ‘Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not.’ The usage of sponsors, of which Tertullian himself bears witness, and still more the almost equally ancient abuse of infant communion, imply the existence of infant baptism.” The learning and ability of Dr. Schaff, and the resources at his command, rendered him fully competent for a thorough investigation of this subject. We have here his conclusion. The truth is, the catholic, or universal Church of Christ, for three hundred years after the apostles, was literally a Pedobaptist Church—a Church that baptized infants. No candid man, who has made the history of the Church, during this period, a specialty in his reading, will venture a denial of the statement. Dr. Gale, of England, brought his batteries to bear upon the historical facts produced by Dr. Wall on this subject; but not a stone did he loosen. We sometimes meet with men who suppose there must have been bodies of Christian people, all along through this period of the Church’s history, that differed from the general Church upon the subject of infant baptism. There is, however, no evidence that this was the case; but there is evidence that it was *not* the case.

Irenæus, about seventy-six years after the death of the Apostle John, wrote a work, in which he gave a list of all the sects that had sprung up during that time. He gave not only a list of them, but also a synopsis of every tenet of their doctrines in which they differed from the true Church. Each sect he mentions, and also every item in which they differed from the Church catholic concerning baptism; but he says nothing of any difference in reference to the baptism of infants. The “fountain and original,” from which each sect sprung, he recounts. Some of them denied baptism altogether; some used many foolish ceremonies in connection with baptism; some mixed oil and water together, and poured the mixture upon the person for baptism. Others promised “that

all that would be baptized with their baptism should presently have a resurrection; and after that should never die nor grow old, but be immortal." Of all the sects mentioned by Irenæus, and of all the points of difference in doctrine between them and the true Church, there is nothing *pro* or *contra* in regard to the baptism of infants. The very fact that he says nothing of any difference between them, on this subject, is evidence sufficient that no difference existed. He mentions other differences of less importance.

Epiphanius, Philastrius, Austin, and Theodoret, each wrote a work during the fourth century, similar to the one written by Irenæus, and they mention quite a number of sects differing from the Church catholic; but they mention none that denied the baptism of infants. Austin mentions the Pelagian heresy, and says that they agreed with the Church that infants are to be baptized, yet they hold a different opinion concerning the ground or reason of their baptism. His language is: "They do also deny that infants which are descended from Adam, according to the flesh, do, by their first birth, contract any contagion of the anciently threatened death; for they affirm them to be born without any bond of original sin; so that there is nothing in them that needs to be forgiven by the second birth; but that they are baptized for that reason, that, being by this regeneration adopted, they may be admitted to God's kingdom; being by this renewal advanced from a good state to a better, but not absolved from any ill state of the old obligation." (Wall, p. 316.) Austin mentions here the ground of difference upon which these people predicate the baptism of infants, as varying from that of the true Church; and, if any had denied the doctrine, he would have mentioned that also. Austin had said, in another work, that this was the only sect that denied that infants were to be baptized for original sin; and that he knew of none at all who denied it absolutely. Epiphanius reckons, in all, eighty heresies which, he says, "were all that he heard of in the world." He says nothing of any of them in regard to their denying or practicing the baptism of infants. In speaking of the ordinances of the Church, he says: "And for baptism, she (the Church catholic) accounts it to be in Christ, (or to the Christian,) instead of the

old circumcision." Again, he says: "The law had the circumcision in the flesh, serving for a time, till the great circumcision came—that is, baptism—which circumcises us from our sins, and seals us unto the name of God." (Wall, p. 318.)

As it has been shown that the true Church, in its primitive state, practiced infant baptism, so it appears that none of the sects which arose during the first four centuries of the Christian era denied it. It is needless to collect the evidence to prove that the Church practiced the baptism of infants for the next six centuries; for it is considered an admitted fact. Mr. Tombs, an anti-pedobaptist writer, in speaking of this matter in regard to the usage after the fourth century, says: "The authority of Augustine it was which carried the baptism of infants, in the following ages, almost without control." To this Dr. Wall makes the following reply: "Whereas, he puts in the word 'almost,' as if some, though few, did oppose it; there is, on the contrary, not one saying, quotation, or example, that makes against it, produced or pretended, but what has been clearly shown to be a mistake." "As, in the first four hundred years, there is none but Tertullian who advised it to be deferred till the age of reason; and one, Nazianzen, till three years of age, in case of no danger of death; so, in the following six hundred years, there is no account or report of any one man that opposed it at all." (Wall, p. 475.)

Here has been presented, in a nutshell, the history of infant baptism for the first thousand years of the Christian era. If it is absolutely necessary that there should be a regular succession of anti-pedobaptist churches from the apostles, to preserve a valid baptism, then the world has no valid baptism. With the eleventh century begins the controversy concerning the Old Waldenses, as to whether they practiced infant baptism or not. Some Baptist writers make it appear that they were anti-pedobaptists. But their own historians, their Confessions of Faith, and other documents, make it appear that they were Pedobaptists. It is proposed to consider the practice of the Waldenses alone upon this subject, without bringing into the account several other sects—such as the Petrobrusians, Henricians, Paulicians, and others.

The present Waldenses, now dwelling in the valleys of Pied-

mont, who are the posterity of those old ones, do practice the baptism of infants; and they say that their ancestors never practiced otherwise. It is certain that they were found in the practice of infant baptism, in the time of Luther, who sent to know their state and doctrine. The only proof that ever has been presented, or can be, to show that they were not Pedobaptists, is the charge made by Roman Catholic writers, that they neglected the baptism of their infants. But it must be remembered that these writers were the deadly enemies of the Waldenses, and sought to bring accusations against them to procure their destruction. The accusations of an enemy are not, in any case, to be relied upon. Yet, even several of these Roman Catholic writers, in enumerating their errors, say nothing of their denying the baptism of infants. Thus, if we take this bulk of testimony, it denies as much as it affirms. And even the Waldenses themselves declare it to be a slander upon them. Some of their Roman Catholic enemies brought against them, at one time, fourteen charges, for any one, or all of which, they incurred the condemnation of the Roman Church. They answer these charges in detail. The fourth charge was: "That they denied the baptism of infants." (Perrin, p. 26.) They answer this as follows: "Neither is the time nor place appointed for those who must be baptized; but charity and the edification of the Church and congregation ought to be the rule in this matter; yet notwithstanding, we bring our children to be baptized; which they ought to do to whom they are nearest related; as their parents, or those whom God hath inspired with such a charity." (Spiritual Almanac, fol. 45; quoted by Perrin, p. 28.) This answer is definite. It refutes the charge. They say: "We bring our children to be *baptized*." They admit that, sometimes, during severe persecutions, when their own pastors were driven from their homes, they delayed having their children baptized, rather than to have the rite performed by Roman priests. Not only Roman Catholics, but also some Protestants, have taken advantage of this circumstance, and charged upon them that they did not have their infant children baptized.

It is proper to note here that William Jones, a Baptist his-

torian of some prominence, in noticing these charges, in his *History of the Waldenses*, judiciously omits the fourth one, and the answer to it. He was engaged in making a clear history of a succession of anti-pedobaptist churches, from the apostles to the Baptist churches of England. Perrin is the author from whom he quotes, and yet he leaves out a very important item, which honesty and the cause of truth would have compelled him to insert in its place. If he had been a faithful historian, he would have given the world a very different account of these Waldenses from that which he has given.

Vesembecius, Bishop of Cavailon, wishing to convince certain of the Waldenses of their errors, before proceeding to violence, sent among them a certain preaching monk; but this monk soon "withdrew in confusion, saying that he had never, in the whole course of his life, made such progress in the Holy Scriptures as he had made in those few days that he had conferred with the Waldenses." This same bishop then sent among them a "whole troop of young doctors," fresh from the Sorbonne, to confound them with the subtlety of their questions. But they likewise withdrew in confusion; and one of them openly confessed that he had learned more of the doctrine necessary to salvation from these people than by all the theological disputes which he had ever heard in Paris. The same bishop also says: "King Louis XII., of France, having received information, from the enemies of the Waldenses dwelling in Provence, of several heinous crimes which were fathered upon them, sent to the place Adam Fumée, Master of Requests, and a Sorbonnist doctor, called Parui, who was his confessor, to make inquiry into the matter. They visited all their parishes and temples, and neither found there any images or sign of the ornaments belonging to the mass, or ceremonies of the Romish Church; much less could they discover any of those crimes with which they were charged. But rather that they kept the Sabbath duly; caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive Church; and taught them the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God." (Vesembecius, *Oration respecting the Waldenses*; quoted by Perrin, p. 36.) This "Master of

Requests" and the King's "confessor" not only acquitted these people of the charges preferred against them, but state that they "kept the Sabbath duly," and caused their *children* to be *baptized* according to the *primitive Church*. They were Pedobaptists, and, in their practice, followed the example of the primitive Church.

Mr. Jones, in his *History of the Waldenses*, quotes this from Perrin in a garbled manner. Where his author says, "They caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive Church," he says, "They observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive Church." He was under the necessity of leaving out some words and changing others, or else of admitting a Pedobaptist link into his chain; and, rather than do that, he sacrificed both truth and honesty. Who would like to be the advocate of a system that required such a sacrifice? Far better would it be to sacrifice the system. Jones's *History of the Waldenses*, as far as it goes, is but a reproduction of Perrin's *History of the same people*. Take from Jones's *History* what he takes from Perrin, and there is nothing left. And yet Perrin's *History* establishes the fact that the Waldenses were Pedobaptists; and Jones makes it appear that they were anti-pedobaptists. He quotes from Perrin as his authority, but leaves out, or changes, every thing that pertains to the baptism of infants.

Any one who reads Perrin's *History of the Waldenses*, and then reads Jones's, would think—if he did not know to the contrary—that he was reading the history of another kind of Waldenses. The Waldenses of Provence and Dauphiny met in an assembly at Angrogna, Sept. 12, 1535, and "unanimously" adopted, without any "contradiction," a Confession of Faith, the XVIIth Article of which is as follows: "As to the sacraments, it hath been determined, by the Holy Scriptures, that we have but two sacramental signs or symbols, which Christ Jesus hath left unto us: the one is Baptism, the other the Eucharist, or Lord's-supper, which we receive to demonstrate our perseverance in the faith, according to the promise we made in our baptism in our infancy; as also in remembrance of that great benefit which Jesus Christ hath conferred upon us, when he laid down his life for our redemp-

tion, cleansing us with his most precious blood." (Perrin, p. 82.) They say, in the preamble to this Confession of Faith, that the doctrine therein contained "had been delivered from father to son among them, and taken out of the word of God." They say expressly that they had been *baptized in their infancy*. They declare this to have been the faith and practice of their ancestors. Perrin gives, from some of their old manuscripts, an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments. Upon the sacrament of baptism they say: "The things that are not necessary in baptism, are the exorcisms, the breathings, the signs of the cross upon the infant, either on the breast or the forehead, the salt put into the mouth, the spittle into the ears and nostrils, the unction of the breast, the monk's cowl, the anointing of the chrism upon the head, and divers the like things, consecrated by the prelate; as also the putting the taper in his hands, clothing it with a white vestment, the blessing of the water, the dipping of it thrice in the water. All these things, used in the administration of the sacrament, are not necessary, they neither being of the substance, nor requisite in the sacrament of baptism; from which things many take an occasion of error and superstition, rather than edification to salvation. Now, this baptism is visible and material, which maketh the party neither good nor evil, as it appeareth in the Scripture, by Simon Magus and Paul. And whereas baptism is administered in a full congregation of the faithful, it is to the end that he that is received into the Church should be reputed and held of all for a Christian brother, and that all the congregation might pray for him that he might be a Christian in heart, as he is outwardly esteemed to be a Christian. And for this cause it is, that we present our children in baptism; which they ought to do, to whom the children are nearest, as their parents, and they to whom God hath given this charity." (Perrin, p. 231.) This lengthy quotation is made, because in it is given an exposition of the sacrament of baptism. It contains not simply an incidental allusion to the subject. No objection appears in it to the baptism of infants, but to the superstitious additions and to the dipping of the infant thrice into the water. Instead of objecting to the baptism of infants,

they say: "And for this cause it is, that we present our children in baptism." The baptism of infants was a part of their doctrine. There is nothing in their history or Confessions of Faith to the contrary.

It is said by Eneas Sylvius, in his History of the Taborites, that Wickliffe and Huss were moved, by the example of the Waldenses, to throw off the Papal yoke. The Taborites were the followers of John Huss, and were called Taborites from the name of the town in which they lived. "Eneas Sylvius reporteth of Peter de Dreeze and James de Misne, disciples and followers of the Waldenses, that they traveled into Bohemia in the time of John Huss, and that, after some conference and conversation with him, they taught him their doctrine. They themselves do not deny it; for they say that Wickliffe was moved to throw off the Papal yoke by the example of the Waldenses, and that Wickliffe was the means and instrument which God made use of for the instruction of John Huss who taught in Bohemia, and that, therefore, they thought themselves very much obliged to the churches of the Waldenses; since whatsoever is good in them, they say, was transplanted into theirs, and so they were, in one sense, the beginning and original of their churches." (History of the Taborites, quoted by Perrin, p. 109.) From this authority, it appears that the reformed churches, in their very incipency, received shape and doctrine from the Waldensian churches. It is a notable fact that the doctrines taught and preached by Wickliffe, and Huss, and Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, were the same that had been preached by the Waldenses long before. The Waldenses and the reformed churches formed alliances with each other on all suitable occasions, for mutual encouragement and instruction, holding, as they said, the same doctrines of salvation. The Waldenses received teachers from the reformed churches, and *vice versa*. This unity of doctrine between these churches is so palpable, that even Jones, with all his prejudice, admits it. Another remarkable fact is, that the Waldenses formed no connections with the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, as they formed with the Pedobaptists of the Reformation under Luther and Calvin. They speak as follows in regard to the reformed religion: "We

protest and declare that, being very well assured that the doctrine and religion taught and practiced by the reformed churches of France, Switzerland, Germany, Geneva, England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, and other kingdoms, countries, and lordships, is the only true Christian doctrine and religion approved of and established by God who alone can make us acceptable to himself and bring us to salvation, we are resolved to follow it at the expense of our lives and fortunes, and to continue therein to the end of our lives." (Perrin, p. 92.) They say, upon the same page, that they had been brought up in this doctrine from their infancy, and that they had taught it to their families, as it had been taught to them by their ancestors.

In this and in the former article the attempt has been made to present a synopsis of the History of Infant Baptism. As to the period from the time of the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, to the present, nothing need be said. The dispute is in regard to the history of the *primitive* Church. The evidence seems to be that there were no anti-pedobaptists during that period of time. If there were any, history does not mention them. Origen knew nothing of them in his time. St. Cyprian, fifty years later, makes no allusion to them. St. Austin and Pelagius had never heard or read of them!

ART. VIII.—*Two Kinds of Decrees.*

THE subject of God's decrees has vexed the Christian world a great deal. The question, however, has not been whether or not God is the author of decrees—has made decrees. This is admitted by all. It is a truth as clearly taught, perhaps, as any in the Bible. But the manner in which these decrees operate upon and affect human freedom, is not so clear to all. What influence—what bearing—these decrees have upon individual destiny, is a point surrounded by many seeming doctrinal difficulties. This is the real point at issue—the point about which so many "tough debates and harsh controversies"

have occurred—over which so many hard moral battles have been fought.

The design in this paper is to examine into the nature and kinds of decrees presented to us in the economy of God's government. By way of preface, the investigation of the subject is introduced with the following general proposition: Two kinds of decrees are apparent in God's government—absolute and conditional. God is not only an almighty Creator, but is also an all-wise Governor of his creation. And he has, perhaps, displayed that wisdom in no clearer light, or to any better advantage, than in his wisely adapting his government, in all its parts, precisely to the nature of the governed. Now, creation, so far as we have acquired a knowledge of it, is divided into three grand departments, viz.: Inanimate Nature; The Brute Creation; and Intelligent Man. Are these all governed alike? by one law, or laws of precisely the same nature? Manifestly they are not, because their natures are too widely different and distinct to admit of any such general classification and wholesale government. A brief survey of each of these three departments, separately, in the order mentioned, may serve to give us clearer views of the government exercised over them, the nature of the decrees which are brought to bear upon them, and the extent to which they are affected by such decrees.

I. Inanimate Nature.

This is governed by the first class of decrees herein presented—decrees which are absolute in their nature. The government exercised over it is arbitrary—absolute—necessarily so, in order to meet the nature of the governed. To the ocean God hath set bounds and barriers, and hath said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed;" and though he rage, and boil, and lift himself up in fury, and surge madly against the shore, still his proud waves must spend their fury and sink, "like a spoiled child to slumber," at the foot of the breakers. The decree is *absolute*. He may not—cannot—ignore its force. God has made the sun, and hung it out in its orbit, like a mighty lamp, to blaze and burn without cessation, till the same hand that made it shall extinguish it. Our earth, too, will continue

to swing around in its course, till He whose breath first gave it motion, shall bid it "dissolve like snow." There is a great theological truth—as well as philosophy and poetry—in the language of the poet when he sings:

Rivers to the ocean run,
Nor stay in all their course;
Fire, ascending, seeks the sun—
Both speed them to their source.

Yes, all inanimate nature is mutely, silently, but none the less surely, working out the high behests of the Almighty, because it cannot possibly do otherwise. God does not consult its volition, for it has none to consult. Hence, it is necessarily governed by decrees which are absolute in their nature, involving no conditions—no contingencies.

II. The Brute Creation.

No such absolute and unconditional government is found to be exercised upon this part of creation; because its nature is different and demands a different law. God, in wisdom, has implanted in the brute an element—a principle—for his guidance, which is called instinct, whatever that may mean. Though it is considered to be, of a certain kind—of a low grade, it must be admitted, but still it is thought. Furthermore, we find it is more unerring in its nature, its operations, and its practical results, than is the boasted power of reason in man. It is a remarkable fact that animals—if, indeed, they make mistakes at all—make much fewer than men do. Still we are not to conclude that they are driven on by an inexorable fatality. We have no warrant for such a conclusion. They are not fit subjects for such stern and absolute government. The milder law, or light of instinct, governs them.

III. Intelligent Man.

Now, is he governed either as inert matter or as the brute? Certainly not; because his nature so widely differs from that of either of them. He is a reasoning creature. He can reflect, consider, compare, decide. He can act or neglect to act, choose or refuse, at his own pleasure. We all know that we have this freedom of thought and action. Hence, we are not fit subjects for the stern and absolute decrees that govern either the inanimate or the brute creation. The decrees that

govern us must be of a different nature, must be conditional, dependent upon our volition. God cannot (be it spoken with reverence) compel us to any course of action contrary to our will, and, at the same time, hold us accountable for our acts. The whole tenor of his word shows that he does not design so to do; for every offer of life and salvation is founded upon conditions. Witness the case of the impotent man at the pool. "Wilt thou be made whole?" says the Saviour. Is it thy wish, thy choice? Here is an appeal directed pointedly to the man's volition. So with the withered arm. Did Christ thrust a cure upon the man regardless of his wish in the matter? or did he simply give him power to stretch out his arm at his own pleasure? Manifestly the latter. So with the sinner. He is saved or lost in accordance with his own wish in the matter, and not in accordance with any decree of God to that end.

The subject of God's decrees has been greatly obscured—mystified—by attempting to confound them with his foreknowledge. Predestinarians, reasoning from God's admitted foreknowledge, conclude that "some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death." The premise may be admitted, but the conclusion is denied. "But," says one, "if God *absolutely foreknew* that I was to be lost, how can I do otherwise than be lost? Must he not have decreed it before he could foreknow it as a certain fact?" Certainly not. If God foreknew that the man would be lost, it was because he also foreknew that the man would, in the exercise of his volition, freely refuse the costly remedy which all-abounding love would provide for him. God foreknows the actions of men, their acceptings and rejectings, their choosings and refusings, as well as their final destinies.

The main point of difference on this subject between the views of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and those expressed by consistent predestinarians, if the writer correctly apprehends it, is with respect to the *nature* of the electing decree. They maintain that certain men and angels are unchangeably foreordained to everlasting life, and the rest to everlasting death, and that their number is so certain and definite that it

can be neither increased nor diminished. As a Church, we believe that God has foreördained—decreed—(let us not be afraid of the word) that all—every one—who will comply with certain conditions—which he designed to make known—should be saved, and that all who would not thus comply, should be lost. This was the decree—and it is *plainly conditional*—and, then, being an omniscient being, he could look along down the stream of time, and see—and even call by name—every one who would thus, in the exercise of his or her agency—volition—comply with the terms, and be saved, and every one who would refuse and be lost; and yet he would not touch their freedom to choose or refuse at pleasure. The *foreknowledge* is *absolute*—necessarily so; because it is an attribute, a necessary part, of his being; but the *election* is *conditional*, hinged upon man's volition. It is only an act of his, in no way necessary to his existence. They are not, therefore, one and the same thing, but different and distinct. The one may exist without the other.

In no other way can we reconcile the absolute sovereignty of God with the free and untrammelled agency of man. Why should God offer life and salvation to *all men*, if he himself has decreed that a large portion of them shall never be saved? Why constitute and set in motion a vast machinery, involving oftentimes the sacrifice of life, as well as millions of treasure, for the purpose of saving men, when, for thousands—ay, perhaps millions of years—the very names of many of them have been enrolled upon the registers of the damned? Would not this present God to his universe in the light of an arbitrary, despotic, and unjust Governor? Here is the truth, if we understand aright the teaching of God's word. The offer of life is made in good faith to all alike, the decree of life being at first conditional, and, from time to time, just as men comply with the conditions, the decree—till then conditional—becomes an absolute one, and they are sealed to eternal life, or, as they persistently refuse, the privilege and power of complying with the conditions are withdrawn, and they are sealed to perdition.

If the decree of election were absolute, from the far-back counsels of eternity, why do the Scriptures say, "*After that*

ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise"? Why are we exhorted to "use all diligence to make our calling and election *sure*," if it be already secured by an absolute and eternal decree? Why are we taught that Christ is the "Saviour of all men," especially of them that believe, if it be not to show that he is a *conditional*, possible Saviour to all, and an *absolute* Saviour to the believer? Why are we taught to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," if there be no conditions for us to perform, and no contingencies in the matter? It seems apparent that neither Divine nor human agency—the one to the exclusion of the other—is employed in our salvation. We are to "work out our own salvation, God working in us, both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure."

These lines are written in no spirit of controversy, but simply with a desire to do good. May the Spirit of all grace control all, and cause it to redound to the glory of God and the good of souls!

ART. IX.—*The Day of the Six Creative Days.*

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. (1 Thess. v. 21.)

As Augustine teacheth, there are two things to be observed in questions of this kind: First, That the truth of Scripture be inviolably maintained; second, Since Divine Scripture may often be explained in many ways, that no one cling to any particular exposition with such pertinacity that, if what he supposed to be the teaching of Scripture should turn out to be plainly false, he would nevertheless presume to put it forward; lest thereby sacred Scripture should be exposed to the derision of unbelievers, and the way of salvation be closed to them. (*Thomas De Opere Secundæ Diei.* Trans. by Dr. Molloy.)

THE spirit actuating the student of true faith, when seeming difficulties arise in his studies of the word and works of God, has been sufficiently dwelt upon in a previous article. Nothing more is here to be added, than simply to commend the reader to the foregoing text and to the sentiments of the good and Scripture-loving Father Augustine.

We have in Genesis a remarkable and grand account of

creation. It contains what God has seen fit to reveal concerning the origin of the world. The account is a brief, but comprehensive, outline history, and is unquestionably true. The proper understanding of it is a matter of great interest and importance. Parts of the history are not easily understood; have sadly puzzled commentators, and given rise to more or less controversy for centuries. Not a few suppose that such controversy has existed only since the establishment of geology as a science; but this is a great mistake. "What mean these days," says the great Father Augustine, long before geology was born—"these strange, sunless days: *quid volunt dies transacti sine luminaribus?* They are *dies ineffabiles*; their true nature cannot be told—*dies cujusmodi sunt, aut perdifficile nobis aut etiam impossibile est cogitare, quanto magis dicere*. Hence they are called days, as the best symbol by which the idea could be expressed. They are God-divided days and nights, in distinction from the sun-divided."* Thus wrote Augustine in the fifth century. Other fathers wrote on the same *dies ineffabiles*, differing more or less from each other in opinion; and some of their views would now be considered by many any thing but orthodox. No; geology did not originate the controversy, although it may have, in modern time, revived it. It is the offspring mainly of our predilections and ignorance.

It is proposed, in this article, to present some thoughts on the meaning of the word "day," as used so formally by the sacred writer in the phrases—"and the evening and the morning were the first day," "and the evening and the morning were the second day," and so on to the sixth day. The writer claims no special originality for what follows. It is intended, when occasion presents itself, to quote freely from such works as may be at hand. The subject will be considered from a scriptural point of view, leaving for another time the geological considerations which bear upon it.

The most common view, and the one to which some of us were trained in early years, is, that the word *day*, as here used,

* Professor Tayler Lewis in Dr. Lange's *Genesis*—a book which should be in the hands of all ministers and students.

means an ordinary day of twenty-four hours. Many good men, however, object to this, insisting that the Scriptures teach a different doctrine, namely, that the word stands for a period—a very long one it may be. Now, with these differences before us, it becomes us to study the subject diligently, that we may know, if within our power, what *the truth* is. This is especially obligatory on those who assume to be teachers of truth. "*Buy the truth, and sell it not!*" It will not do to rest contented with a present opinion, if we have not carefully considered all the facts in the case. What, then, must be our method in this particular instance? Why, surely the same as that followed in the elucidation of any difficult portion of Scripture. First of all, we must ask God to help us while we labor to help ourselves. We must be willing, heartily willing, to give up preconceived opinions, if facts require it; we must then take our Bibles—our Hebrew Bibles, if this be at all practicable—and study critically every word and phrase bearing upon the question; compare parallel passages; and, moreover, seek for the spirit, the meaning, and the attending circumstances of the whole. To this work, indeed, we must call in as helps all the knowledge that God has placed within our reach, that can in any way throw light upon the subject. Let this knowledge be philosophical, botanical, zoölogical, geographical, astronomical, archæological, geological, or of any kind. Any other method would be at fault, and would not be exhaustive. How often have geography and archæology made passages of Scripture clear and satisfactory! So all branches of human learning may be made tributary to the clearing up of difficulties, and we are not at liberty to discard them, or any light they may give. If there be occasion, we must listen to the voice of Job, when he says: "*Speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee.*"

But, to return, it is not proposed, at present, to undertake so exhaustive a discussion. The object is simply to view the question in the light of Scripture.

First, let it be observed that the Hebrew word יום (*yom*)—translated *day*—occurs in the course of the history of creation (that is to say, from the beginning of the account to the seventh verse, inclusive of the second chapter) no less than

fifteen times, and that it is far from having the same signification throughout. It has, in fact—whatever view we choose to adopt of the six creative days—no less than four different meanings. These are as follow:

(1) *Day is the light.* We read, in the fifth verse of the first chapter, "And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." Now, as to the kind of light meant here, we have nothing to say. It certainly was not sunlight, such as characterized the days of the fourteenth and sixteenth verses, for the sun was not made; nor have we any *data* for determining the duration of this light. In the same verse we have the first *creative day*, the signification of which is under discussion.

(2) *Day is twelve hours* in the fourteenth, sixteenth, and eighteenth verses. Strictly, day is here the portion of the twenty-four-hour day lit up by the sun, and is more or less variable as to duration. We read (verse 14): "And God said, Let there be light in the firmament of the heaven to divide the *day* from the night." (Verse 16:) "And God made two great lights: the greater light to rule the *day*, and the lesser light to rule the night." (Verse 18:) "And to rule over the *day* and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness."

(3) *Days are periods of twenty-four hours*, in the latter part of the fourteenth verse: "And let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for *days* and years."

(4) *Day is a period including all the creative days*, in the fourth verse of the second chapter: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the *day* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens."

So far, then, as the mere signification of the word *day* (*yom*), in the account itself, is concerned, a creative day may be a twenty-four-hour day, or a longer period. It will not do, on such grounds, to say that it must be one and cannot be the other. It would appear, from the use made of the word, that by *day* was primarily intended a portion of time, long or short, marked off, in some way, with a beginning and an ending—a "circle, or round of time," which is the meaning generally given to our word *period*. This is the only idea, common to the various significations, here given. It is certainly true that, in many passages of Scripture, outside of the account

of creation, the word has this meaning, the period often being a long one. We have, for example, the day of Jerusalem, the day of Israel, the day of salvation, the day of mercy, and other similar passages. In Amos (viii. 11-13) we read: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord; and they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it. In that *day (yom)* shall the fair virgins and young men faint for thirst." The prophets very commonly use the word *yom* for a period of tribulation: "Slay all her bullocks; let them go down to the slaughter; woe unto them! for their *day* is come, *the time* of their visitation." (Jer. l. 27.) Many other similar passages might be given in which day stands for period. We have, "also, the idea of the *day of God*," or of the *day of the Lord*: "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." (Ps. xc. 4.) The thousand years spoken of in Revelation (chap. xx.), is sometimes referred to as the day of the Lord. Finally, attention may be directed to the common expression, *Een to this day*; that is to say, to this time or period.

From all this it follows that, in so far as *yom* itself is concerned, it may be, as has been said, either a common twenty-four-hour day or a *period* of much longer duration. As to which the creative day is, must be determined by other considerations. It may be said at once that the lights before us lead us to believe that the creative days were periods of great duration. And this view appears to be the most natural and the most in accordance with the spirit of the text. The writer is far from being alone in this opinion. Many of our best Christian scholars thus interpret the creative days; and it is to be noted that the author of the latest, and doubtless the greatest, Commentary on Genesis, Dr. Lange, holds to this view.

It is to be observed, in the first place, that the creative days are introduced into the account in a remarkably measured style. Other days are spoken of, but not in the same peculiar

language. The English translation—"And the evening and the morning were the first day"—does not fairly give the original. The Hebrew is, "And there was an evening, and there was a morning—one day." How formal this! It would appear as if the language were intended to call attention to the day as an extraordinary one; a day peculiar, and in harmony with the wonderful work in hand. "And God calls it [the light] day, whilst the former state [darkness] he calls night. It is his own naming, and we must take it as our guide in the interpretation of the words. It is not any duration, but the phenomenon, the appearing itself, that is first called day. Then the term is used for a period, to denote the whole event, or the whole first cycle of events, with its two great antithetical parts: 'And there was an evening, and there was a morning—one day.' We look into the account to see what corresponds to this naming. What was the night? Certainly the darkness on the face of the waters. What was the morning? Certainly the light that followed the brooding spirit and the commanding word. How long was the day? How long, the night, or the darkness? The account tells us nothing about it. There is something on its face which seems to repel any such question. The whole spirit and style of the account are at war with the narrowness and arbitrariness of any such computation. Where are we to get twelve hours for this first night? Where is the point of commencement, when darkness *began* to be on the face of the waters? All is vast, sublime, immeasurable. The time is as formless as the material. It has, indeed, a chronology, but on another scale than that which was afterward appointed (verse 14) to regulate the history of a completed world with its sky-gazing human inhabitant. One who thinks seriously on the difficulty of accommodating this first great day to twenty-four hours, as we now measure them, needs no other argument. And yet the decision here settles the question. This first day is the model, in this respect, for all the rest." *

In the second place, the following consideration is presented. A writer, whether inspired or not, is expected to be

* Professor Lewis in Lange's *Genesis*, p. 132.

consistent with himself. Moses, in this case, is the writer, and it is through his conceptions, or ideas, that God has seen fit to guide us to the truth. We then look for harmony in the representations given to us by Moses. The idea that he had of an ordinary day was necessarily, in substance, like that which we have—a portion of time marked off by certain celestial phenomena, such as the rising and the setting of the sun, and having its hours, noon, and midnight. There can be no other idea of such a day. Now, strip it of these characteristics, and what is left? Let there be no sun, no moon, no stars to measure it off, to give it a beginning and an ending, a noon and a midnight, and what does it become? A mere naked conception which it is very difficult to appreciate—a measured portion of time, in the absence of all means of measurement. And now mark that it was not until the *fourth* creative day that “God said, Let there be light in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and seasons, and for days and years.” Here sun-measured time begins, the twenty-four-hour day being one of the units of measurement. It is not consistent to suppose that this day could have been in the mind of Moses as he throws himself back into time when there was no sun. When he *begins* the account, all is to him, for the moment, in chaos; and it is only as he proceeds, step by step, that the facts of creation appear in order before him. It is not until the fourth creative day is reached that he is presumed to know any thing about the sun, or the day which depends upon it. His “*one day*,” or *first day*, then, must have had no necessary connection with the sun-measured day; and its evening and morning were features by no means identical with the evening and morning of the latter. It seems wholly unnecessary, to say the least of it, to embarrass the account by making the creative period a solar day. It is certainly in opposition to its very spirit and grandeur. “He [Moses] had just what he has given to us—the idea of a period commencing in darkness and ending in light; a bounded period, measured by chaos on the one hand, and the birth of a higher organization on the other; a period to which, for these reasons, there is given that name *yom*, which is afterward used of the cyclical solar succession of

light and darkness. But of the duration of this day he has not told us, because there was no revealed conception of it present to his own mind; for so we must judge in the absence of all opposing proof. Here, then, beyond all question, the easy and unforced interpretation is on the side of the indefinite periods. We must say that we never saw an answer to it that did not appear far-fetched and unnatural. What, too, would seem to add strong conformation, is the fact that, in the beginning of the next chapter, the whole time of creation, including all the periods in one completed round, or *course of events*, is, on this account, also called a day; *In the day when the Lord made the heavens and the earth*. Of this great day of days it might also have been said, there was an evening and a morning. It began when darkness was upon the face of the waters; it ended in the glorious morning of Paradise."*

It is worthy of note, again, that the Hebrew poets, in their allusions to the great facts of creation, make no reference to day-periods of twenty-four hours. There is great beauty and grandeur in their descriptions. All is on a vast scale as to power, work, and, apparently, time. Thus, in Job, God himself says: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measures thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it?" etc. In the 104th Psalm we have another glorious hymn in praise of God and his creative works. But nowhere is there a passage that would bring us down to human solar days as the time-units of the illimitable Creator. "They [the Hebrew poets] expatiate, at times, upon every thing else that is wonderful in the first chapter of Genesis—the birth of light, the stretching out of the firmament, the division of the waters from the waters, the separation of the dry land from the former universal ocean, the bounding of the wild waves, the breathing into man of the spirit of life. But instead of the most remote allusions to these marvelously short days, such as would have had the most tempting charm for them, had they possessed the Talmudic or Rabbinical spirit, there is evidently a laboring, as in

* "Six Days of Creation," p. 75.

Job, and Proverbs viii., to set forth the immensely prolonged antiquities of the proceeding. May we not regard the fact, too, that they were kept from any such puerilities and vain imaginations, as a striking evidence of their being truly inspired by that creative Spirit who employed their poetical conceptions and emotions as the best medium through which His own great thoughts could find their most vivid utterance to the human soul?" (Professor Lewis.)

Finally, the manner in which the seventh day is presented in the account is an argument for the doctrine of indefinite periods. This day follows in succession, and is in the same category with the rest. The interpretation given to one must be given to all. Now it is to be observed that, in this case, the formal—"There was an evening, there was a morning"—does not occur. Why is this? Why the exception? If God rested but twenty-four hours, why is not the sun-day measured off in harmony with the others, with its beginning and its ending? There must be a reason for this omission; for, like every word, so every change in the narration, every apparent exception to the general method, has its meaning. The question is easily and naturally answered in this way: Moses did not have in his mind the conception of a finished period, much less that of a twenty-four-hour day, as God's Sabbath. When he wrote, the divine Sabbath had not ended. It may even yet be in progress, to end when the last trump shall sound, and the glorious light of God's favor shall break upon his accepted children; or it may have ended when Christ began on earth the work of redemption. Here is a sufficient reason for the omission. It was not a completed time; hence the antithetical expression was not used.

It has been objected to this view of the seventh day, that it is mentioned, in the fourth commandment, in direct connection with the earth-days of man's labor and rest. With some this settles the question in favor of the twenty-four-hour hypothesis; and there is, at first sight, force in the objection. It must be remembered, however, that the language—"For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it"—is mainly a repe-

tition of what we find in Genesis, and will get its meaning from the account itself. Moreover, we have no more right to assume that God's day is the same as man's day in duration, because thus connected, than we have to assume that God's work and rest are the same, in kind and degree, as man's work and rest, because connected; the latter inference would be quite as logical as the former. But nothing can be more in point than to quote again, in conclusion, from Professor Lewis: "What a difference there must have been between God's work and man's work—above all, between God's ineffable repose and the rest demanded for human weariness! Must we not carry the same difference into the *times*, and make a similar ineffable distinction between the Divine working-days and the human working-days—the God-divided days, as Augustine calls them, and 'the sun-divided days,' afterward appointed to us 'for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years,' of our lower chronology? Such a pointing to a higher scale is also represented in the *Septennial Sabbath*, and in the great jubilee period of seven times seven. They expand upward and outward, like a series of concentric circles; but the greatest of them is still a sign of something greater; and how would they all collapse, and lose their sublime import, if we regard their antitype as less than themselves, or, in fact, no greater than the least! The other analogy, instead of being forced, has in it the highest reason. It is the true and effective order of contemplation. The lower, or earthly, day is made a memorial of the higher. We are called to *remember* it. In six [human] days do all thy work; for in six [Divine] days the Lord made heaven and earth. The juxtaposition of the words, and the graduated correspondence which the mind is compelled to make, aid the reminiscence of the higher idea. An arc of a degree on the small earthly circle represents a vastly wider arc as measured on the celestial sphere. A *sign* of our swiftly-passing times corresponds to one ineffably greater in the higher chronology of world-movements, where one day is a thousand years, and the years are reckoned from *Olam* to *Olam* (Ps. xc. 2), whilst the *Olams* themselves become units of measurement to the *Maleuth col Olamim*, or 'the kingdom of all eternities.' There is a har-

mony in this which is not only sublimely rational, but truly Biblical. It is the manner of Scripture thus to make times and things on earth representatives, or under-types, of things in the heavens. Viewed from such a stand-point, these parallelisms, in the language of the fourth commandment, suggest *of themselves* a vast difference between the Divine and the human days, even if it were the only argument the Bible furnished for that purpose. As the *work* to the *work*, as the *rest* to the *rest*, so are the *times* to the *times*."

Are not "His ways higher than our ways, and His thoughts than our thoughts, even as the heavens are higher than the earth?" Is not the measure of them "longer than the earth and broader than the sea?"

"O magnify the Lord with me, and let us exalt his name together!"

ART. X.—*Ministerial Education.*

If the Apostle Paul, in view of the weighty responsibilities resting on him as a minister of the gospel, performed the duties of his office "in fear and in much trembling," how much more should an uninspired man, with fearful forebodings, enter upon his duties even preparatory to engaging in the sacred and responsible trust of preaching the gospel to dying men! As he toils, as he enters into the true spirit of those branches of study which pertain more directly to his calling, so will be his success. — If Paul needed the prayers and sympathies of the Church, in order to sustain him in his labors, how much more the uninspired men of modern times, in their preparation for their life-time work, in their labors of love when acting as watchmen on the walls of Zion! They are the heralds of the cross; and the salvation of immortal souls depends upon their rightly unfolding the plan of salvation, properly interpreting the sacred oracles, and rightly applying the principles of eternal truth to the hearts and consciences of sinful men. May we not, then, with propriety,

say to the Church, Let fervent prayer from warm hearts ascend, as holy incense from an altar to a throne of grace, that God's choicest blessings may rest upon the institutions of learning where our ministers are educated, and that the baptism of the Holy Spirit may be upon those who impart instruction to those who are to go forth to publish salvation to a dying world?

Law, medicine, and theology are usually denominated the learned professions. If the lawyer needs a legal education in order that he may successfully meet the requirements of his profession; if the physician, who applies the remedies necessary to restore the diseased body to its wonted health, must be well versed in all the mysteries and intricacies of anatomy, physiology, and *materia medica*; how much more ought he to be thoroughly instructed in the principles of his profession, who deals, not with the temporal interests of his fellow-man, nor with his body which has, at most, only an ephemeral existence; but, by the appointment of God, applies the healing balm to the sin-sick soul, which must eternally perish in Tophet, unless the saving remedy is properly administered? The gospel minister deals not with temporal things which are seen, but with eternal, which are not seen; not with this world, which perishes with its using, but with the next, which abideth forever, even as the throne of God. Hence theology, which teaches us what are the character and attributes of God, the duties and relations which we sustain and owe to him and to each other, must be the most sublime of all sciences.

As, however, we find man ignorant, having little or no knowledge of the sublime truths of theology, he must be instructed; he must have a teacher who can explain and unfold to his benighted mind what are to him hidden mysteries. It is the office of the minister to give him the needed instruction. The preacher is a teacher who publicly, by oral discourse, instructs his hearers in the gospel plan of salvation. His theme is the most sublime that ever employed the thoughts or engaged the faculties of mortal man; yea, more, even the angelic host; for they desire to look into the mysteries of redemption!

Such an order of men as preachers of the gospel did not

exist during either the patriarchal or the Mosaic dispensation. The chief allusions to preaching, in the Old Testament, are prophetic of the Messiah and his mission. The term preacher, in a single book of the Old Testament, is applied to Solomon, and by the New to Noah. The specific office of Noah was to forewarn men of the deluge. The Scripture record would not at all warrant us in supposing that any systematic efforts were made for the salvation of men by what is properly denominated preaching. Solomon applies the term preacher to himself; he instructed the people by proverbs, songs, and scientific writings, and not by what is now called preaching. The Hebrew term—*Koh-leh-leth*—is derived from a verb signifying to assemble; the noun signifies an assembly or congregation. The term, therefore, means one who assembles a congregation. Though it is applied, in the Old Testament, to no person except Solomon, yet Jonah was appointed to go and preach unto the Ninevites. The Jewish prophets, though not preachers in the proper sense of the word, were a class of religious teachers whose office was analogous to that of preachers under the Christian dispensation. Clearly was this analogy recognized by our Saviour, when he said of the men of Nineveh that they “repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here.”

Judaism was eminently a religion of ceremonies. The office of the Levitical priesthood was chiefly to offer sacrifices typical of Christ. When he came, their office was done away. It could not have a perpetuation in the Christian Church, seeing the great sacrifice was made a sacrifice which was perfect and had no need to be repeated. But the great Founder of the Christian religion instituted a new order of things. He called and set apart a distinct class of men who, by oral discourse, should, instrumentally, evangelize the world. Though the world was then more than four thousand years old, and man's experience was varied, and he thought himself wise, yet he was so foolish as to suppose such an instrumentality inadequate and absurd for so great a work as that proposed by the gospel scheme. In this precise manner, nevertheless, “God made foolish the wisdom of this world. For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God,

it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe."

The appointment was in accordance with the Divine manner of dealing with men, as indicated in the word of God. New faculties and new agencies are not created, but those already in existence are set apart, and, by Divine appointment, perform a new office. Thus, when God saw fit to appoint a token of his covenant that he would not again destroy the world by a flood, he did not create a new emblem, but he used one that resulted from the then existing laws of nature. He set his bow in the cloud, which (now being that token) is invested with a new and peculiar interest, a new significance. The appointment of it as a bow of promise was original; but the bow itself was as ancient as the morning of creation, and had, with its varied hues, spanned the heavens from that hour "when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

On the introduction of the gospel, the true religion ceases to be one of ceremonies. The mind and heart of man are addressed; his reasoning faculties are called into action. These can be most efficiently addressed and influenced by the living orator. The Saviour himself becomes the first preacher of the new covenant. By a most happy combination of truth, illustrated by figures drawn from the every-day pursuits of men, and by appeals made to their consciences, he greatly moved his hearers, and they were constrained to say: "Never man spake like this man." The preacher of the gospel must take Jesus Christ as his pattern. His mind and his heart filled with his theme, he appears before his audience, and, in the deep pathos of his soul, portrays to their minds the turpitude of sin, its awful consequences, the dying agonies of the Son of God to redeem man, the joys of the heavenly world, and the agonizing death of transgressors. They see a broken law, an angry God. They, like the jailer, see themselves utterly undone, lost, and ruined, and cry out from the depths of their souls: "What must I do to be saved?" Here the man of God, sympathizing with the sin-sick soul, points him to the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world. He thus not only fills the most important office to which a

mortal man can be called, but becomes a worker with God, and nearly allied to Jesus Christ in the labors of love in which he engaged while here on earth. It is the most important and noble work which can engage the faculties of man. It contemplates nothing less than the evangelization of the whole world. A world that lies in sin and wickedness, having departed from God, is to be led to repentance, a turning away from sin, and to allegiance to God. The mission of the Church is to accomplish this work. Ministers are the appointed leaders of the Lord's hosts. Upon them rests, in an especial manner, the responsibility for the accomplishment of this great work. They, therefore, have not only a very responsible, but a high and holy calling. "The preacher goes forth as a messenger of the King of kings to announce to a lost world the tidings of salvation through a risen Saviour. He proclaims the one only name given under heaven or among men whereby we must be saved. He cries aloud, and spares not; he urgently entreats and fervently beseeches men, as in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God; and to leave them without excuse, he reasons of temperance, righteousness, and a judgment to come." (Kidder.)

The elements of the minister's success are his qualifications for the sacred office. Would it not be sacrilegious presumption in any one to attempt to preach the gospel who has not a genuine Christian experience? If the ancient rhetoricians insisted that virtue in an orator is essential to success, how much more in the Christian minister! But may every genuine Christian become a minister? Evidently the Bible teaches that a *Divine call* is essential to the office and gift of preaching. Corresponding to this are the declarations of the Prophet Malachi: "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." The Lord emphatically declared, by the mouth of the Prophet Jeremiah: "I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding." He also said of Paul: "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and the children of Israel." In view of this call, the apostle said: "Woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel!" It was stated

before that the prophets were a class of religious teachers, appointed by God to make known his will, and to declare to men the consequences of disobedience. They were devout and holy in their habits, delivered their messages fearlessly, and reiterated boldly the denunciations of the Almighty, even to kings, and to the powerful potentates of earth. So zealous were these teachers of righteousness as monitors of past and future ages, that "they endured trial of cruel mockings and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments. They were stoned; they were sawn asunder; they were tempted; were slain with the sword; wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens, and in caves of the earth. Nevertheless, through faith, they subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword; out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, and turned to flight the armies of the aliens." As examples, should not the gospel minister imitate them? Surely he should; and the genuine Christian has so done, as the history of the many fiery persecutions, through which the Christian Church has passed, abundantly proves. Great changes have taken place in public opinion. Now very different are the attacks of the enemies of God's children. No longer are the shafts of infidelity hurled against the bodies of Christians; they are directed against the mind and heart. They are a kind of subtile metaphysics, claiming to be ethical philosophy, which gradually, and almost imperceptibly, undermine the foundations of Christianity. Let every soldier of the cross gird himself for the contest, and forget not to take "the shield of faith, wherewith" he "shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked."

The prophets were not ignorant men. Their writings show that they were not only men of deep and fervent piety, but also of extensive and varied learning. They embrace some of the most important facts of history; the most interesting biographies, told in such simplicity of style as to be the admiration of the world; noble specimens of oratory; and the loftiest flights of poetry that were ever recorded. They also

abound in all the beauties of rhetoric, almost every figure of speech being used. Their chief attraction, however, is in the sound principles of morality which they everywhere inculcate, thus evincing their Divine authority. "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and deeds." The Apostle Paul was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel; in other words, he enjoyed the advantages of instruction from the most learned doctor of the law of his day. The advantages of a literary and scientific education were highly appreciated by those distinguished servants of God. From the record of their labors, also, we learn that they were more highly esteemed and respected by their hearers in view of their learning. But, we are told, the apostles were ignorant and unlearned men. This, when properly understood, is far from the truth. When their enemies spake of their being unlearned, they referred to the fact that they had not a professional education—that they had not studied a prescribed course under one of their doctors of the law. Every public instructor was expected to study with a view to that course of training. The same is the proper interpretation of the passages where Christ is spoken of as not being educated. Their writings abundantly show that they were well versed in the Scriptures. But they received their professional education under Him who spake as never man spake, and who taught with authority.

From the foregoing the inference is, that the Christian minister, in selecting the prophets and apostles as models, will first lay the foundation of a life of usefulness by acquiring a good literary and scientific education; and then will learn, in the school of Christ, those lessons which will give him a special fitness for his professional calling. The book of God is the great store-house from which he must draw his supplies; it must emphatically be his text-book. From it he is to learn those lessons which alone should be his guide in his labors. He ought to study it with all the helps which can be brought within his reach. Happy is he who is brought up at the feet of some Gamaliel—some doctor of the law who is well versed in the mysteries of God's word, in the mysteries of redemption. But this book was written in Hebrew and Greek. No

translation can express fully the meaning of the original with that clearness which a knowledge of the original gives. Hence, a knowledge of these languages is of special advantage to him who would fully understand the teachings of the Holy Spirit. He will also find it very beneficial in his studies to use the exegetical works of pious men who have devoted their lives to the study of the Bible.

In regard to the studies which the candidate for the ministry should pursue, and what length of time he should devote to them, there is a difference of opinion. Many think that years spent in the study of the ancient languages is time mostly lost. They say that, if the time thus spent were devoted to preaching the gospel, many would thereby be brought into the fold of Christ, and, eventually, the man who thus had spent his time would, instrumentally, save more souls than if he had spent many years in preparation for his professional work. We would not circumscribe or limit the call of the Spirit. A man of moderate literary attainments may, possibly, in some communities, accomplish more good than one who is highly educated. But, if a man realizes in his own soul that he is called to preach the gospel, let him be diligent in the use of the means which God, in his providence, may afford him. The number of those who may enter the ministry with a very limited education, should be comparatively small. As a general thing, young men can, and ought to, acquire a liberal education. A man of fair talents, entering the ministry young, may become a very acceptable preacher, and be settled as a pastor of a congregation in a thriving place; but, in his social relations, he will often be much embarrassed. By members of his congregation he will often be asked questions, to answer which intelligibly would, perhaps, require a knowledge of Hebrew, or Greek, or the higher mathematics. If he cannot answer the questions for a want of knowledge of these branches, frequently his influence is injured. A living writer has said: "The man who goes forth to proclaim the gospel should be able to *read* it, at least, in the language in which it was originally formed. Why should a man go forth to expound a message to others, which he can neither read nor understand, as it came from the hand of Him

who commissions him? Can there be a more evident unfitness in regard to qualification for a work, than to be ignorant of the very document which it is the main business of his life to present to others? It is almost too absurd for grave remark, to speak of an ambassador who cannot, except by an interpreter, read his credentials; of a lawyer who cannot read even the laws which he expounds; of a teacher who cannot read even the books which he professes to teach. And yet the melancholy fact has existed in this land, and still exists, that, to multitudes of those who are public teachers, the original languages of the Scriptures are unapproached treasures; and that the confidence with which they speak is that of men who depend on the testimony of others for a knowledge of that which it is their appointed business to explain." This is strong language. But is it too strong, in view of the interests at stake? Is it too strong, when we reflect that heresies, schisms, false doctrines, and, may we not say, the loss of the soul itself, are, to a great extent, the fruits of ignorance? May we not say that the more thoroughly a man is prepared for any calling, the more he will accomplish in a given time? or, in other words, that the results of his labors will be in proportion to his qualification for the performance of said labors?

If a man is to become a mechanic, or a professional man, it is thought proper that he should devote years to preparation, spending perhaps a third of his life in the acquisition of the necessary skill and knowledge. Shall he who enters upon the highest, the most important, calling, devote less time to the acquisition of knowledge? A thorough training is necessary. Without it, little success will attend his labors. Eminent success does not depend upon the number of years a man spends in the ministry, but upon the concentration of effort. Strong mental faculties, actively concentrated upon the acquisition of certain ends, will usually be successful. This is emphatically true in the ministry. Many men accomplish more in five years than others in forty. Then give the preacher of the gospel thorough mental training, and a head and heart well imbued with theological lore. Would not less than this be presumption? For does not "every man who stands be-

fore others to preach the gospel, stand there professing his ability to explain, define, and illustrate the book of God; to meet the cavils of its enemies, and to press its great truths on the hearts and consciences of men? His very profession implies that he not merely *believes*, but is able to show to thinking men that this is a revelation of God."

Some object to a learned ministry on the ground that they use "high-sounding words," and in their sermons discourse about things which the common people cannot understand. This, when indulged in, is an abuse of education; in fact, it is the *want of true education*, the want of proper instruction. Let the man of God drink deep at the fountain of spiritual life; let his mind be well disciplined; let him be well versed in the Scriptures—in Scripture sermons which are given as models; let him take Christ's style and manner as models; and no such charge will be brought against him. The common people heard Jesus gladly. Very appropriate in this connection is the advice of Dr. Guthrie: "Fire low! The order which generals have often given to their men before fighting began, suits the pulpit not less than the battle-field. The mistake, common to both soldiers and speakers, is to shoot too high, over people's heads; missing, by a want of directness and plainness, both the persons they preach to and the purpose they preach for."

The successful preacher must have a clear perception of truth. By close mental application he must grasp truth—truth as it is in God's word, in science, in philosophy; as it is in human nature; as it is in its effects on the human heart; and in his mind so elaborate it, that he may divest it of all obscurities, and be enabled to present it in a clear and interesting manner to his congregation. By so doing, he will avoid that dull, prosy style, in which so many are wont to indulge, which is a serious fault in any speaker, but especially in him who, as the ambassador of the King of kings, makes known his behests to dying men. He must so present the truth as not only to get the attention, but hold it. The tenacity of the memory is largely dependent on the degree of attention. His hearers will not be profited, unless the memory retains what is said; and the heart will not be affected, or the man be influ-

enced to act, unless the mind is deeply interested. Furthermore, the human heart is averse to Christian truth; and, unless it be made plain, interesting to the mind, and made to take hold upon the heart, this aversion will cause the sinner not to heed the warning voice, but quietly to pass on in his indifferent and fancied security.

"Knowledge is the foundation of all true religious experience and practice." Sinners "know not God." They are in gross ignorance. They must be instructed. They must have a knowledge of God, of his attributes, of their own hearts—that they are deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. "And moreover, because the preacher was wise, he still taught the people knowledge; yea, he gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order, many proverbs. The preacher sought to find out acceptable words; and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies." Moreover, the Christian minister stands forth before the world as a legate of the skies, with a commission from his Divine Lord: "Go, teach all nations." But when men have received the word of life, then says the Saviour: "Feed my sheep." To this the "faithful shepherd" will give due heed. He will lead them forth "beside the still waters" of love, and cause them to "lie down in the green pastures" of truth.

That a minister may be enabled rightly to fulfill the requirements of the command given in the great commission, thorough mental discipline is necessary. As the body must be supplied with food, to enable it to perform correctly the various offices required of it, so in like manner the mind needs aliment to qualify it for the services of the sanctuary. The servant of God must have his mind well stored with knowledge, and form habits of close and accurate thinking. He must have his thoughts well digested, or he is not prepared to deliver his message to his dying fellow-men. He must also cultivate devotional feelings, and his heart must be disciplined in the school of Christ. If he "cannot profitably occupy the thoughts of another, unless he first thinks," neither can he "teach the sensibilities of others, unless he first feels." As

"no man can be an effective public speaker, who does not know what to say, and how to say it;" as "a vacant or shallow brain cannot pour forth a stream of eloquence;" so an empty heart cannot touch the feelings—cannot cause the deep emotions which must pervade the heart of him who is benefited by the services of the sanctuary. The preacher should go to the sacred desk from his closet. It is in the closet, and there only, that he can get that qualification that will enable him to speak "from the heart to the heart." The successful preacher must cultivate earnestness, sympathy, and the unction of the Holy Spirit. The pious John Angell James said: "Earnestness implies that the subject has not only been selected, but that it has taken full possession of the mind, and has kindled toward it an intense desire of the heart. Earnestness means that the understanding, having selected and appreciated its object, has pressed all the faculties of both mind and body into its pursuit. It urges the soul onward in its career of action at such a speed that it is set on fire by the velocity of its own motion. By the earnest minister the salvation of souls is sought with the obligation of a principle and the ardor of a passion. It is only when the love of Christ constraineth us, and beareth us away with the force of a torrent, that we shall speak with a manner befitting our great theme. If we are not intensely real, we shall be but indifferent preachers. Our animation must be the earnestness, not of rhetoric, but of religion; not of art, but of renewed nature; and not designed to astound, but to move: not the manner studied, and intended merely to attract a crowd and to excite applause, but to save the souls of men from death." He that would win souls for Christ, must be untiring in the prosecution of his work. As in secular pursuits, the tireless prosecution of a specific purpose usually is crowned with success, so the blessing of the Saviour will rest upon the minister whose supreme object, whose all-absorbing desire, is the conversion of his fellow-men.

The Latin poet Horace said:

*Si vis me flere, dolendum est
Primum ipsi tibi.*

"If you wish me to weep, you yourself must first weep."

This but states the universal experience of public speakers. "Who can resist, who would resist, the fascination of a loving nature?" Such men "bear mankind in their arms, and are even the prophets and pioneers of a more loving time. No man is fitted for the pulpit unless gifted with this sympathetic nature." Happily for the cause of truth, the love of Christ gives this sympathetic nature. Dr. Johnson defined unction to be "that fervor and tenderness of address which excite pity and devotion." Webster: "That quality in language, address, or the like, which excites emotion, especially strong devotion; religious fervor and tenderness." As the anointing oil, "that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard; that went down to the skirts of his garments," was essential to set apart the priest for his holy office, and was typical of the baptism of the Holy Spirit; so the gospel minister must be set apart, to his office, by this unction of the Holy Spirit. "Unction is a mild warmth which causes itself to be felt in the powers of the soul. It produces in the spiritual sphere the same effects as the sun in the physical—it enlightens and it warms. It puts light into the soul; it puts warmth into the heart. It causes us to know and to love; it fills us with emotions. Unction, then, is that mild, soft, nourishing, and, at the same time, luminous heat that illumines the spirit, penetrates the heart, moves it, transports it, and is conveyed by him who has received it to the souls and the hearts which are prepared to receive it also." (Vinet.)

The education contemplated and recommended in this article, cannot be obtained without the advantages of a Theological Seminary. A few gifted minds may, without the advantages of such an institution, acquire a thorough professional education; but the number is small. Even they would acquire the knowledge in far less time, and would be more systematic, if they could have the advantages of studying under teachers well qualified to direct their course, and impart the needed light on dark and intricate points. Surely, it is the duty of the Church to provide for the wants of its candidates as a whole, and not for a few who have superior talents. Can our branch of the Church claim that it has done its whole duty, and has not been recreant to the trust committed to it by a

wise and holy God, unless it makes as ample provision for the thorough education of its probationers for the ministry as any other Church—a seminary well endowed, amply supplied with suitable buildings and good libraries? Shall those whose souls thirst for knowledge of holy things—a thirst which can be satiated only by drinking from the fountain-head of sacred literature—be compelled to seek for that knowledge in a sister denomination, or a foreign Church? Self-respect, as well as duty, says, No. To accomplish a work so desirable, requires the united energies of the whole Church. No part, or section, should feel that it ought to be exempt, or that duty does not require it to do its full part. What is the duty of the whole Church, is the duty of each member. If each one would contribute to this enterprise in proportion as God has prospered him, there would, in a very short time, be an ample fund. This, properly appropriated and invested, would afford all the needed facilities. The Presbyteries, then, ought to instruct the probationers under their care to avail themselves of the advantages and privileges of the seminary.

The collegiate, and the professional education, however, may be ever so thoroughly acquired, and yet the man may not become an efficient preacher. They are only necessary helps. To be a true herald of the cross, the man must not only be pious and properly educated mentally, but he must have practice—must be brought into contact with the world—must learn what is in the heart of man; what is its character; what are its wants, its hopes, its aspirations; and what are the marring effects of sin. These cannot be learned from books, but must be learned by actual contact with man, not merely in public, but in private—around the fireside, in the family and social circle. He must thoroughly enter into the religious feelings and sympathies of his people, and study, not only to know the wants of the human soul, but how to supply those wants; not only to learn that the soul hungers and thirsts, but how to afford it food and drink. The practice that will make him ready in the composition and delivery of sermons, and give him efficiency of address to the masses, can be acquired in no way, in so short a time, as by what some call *being an evangelist*; by others, *a circuit-rider*. Let the young minister

have about twenty monthly appointments, and at each of these, in the course of the year, hold a protracted-meeting. He will thereby become, not only an efficient minister, but he will do much good in his Master's vineyard. He must not only cultivate devotional feelings, but must be a faithful student, especially of his Bible. In his pulpit-efforts, he must learn, in a certain sense, to rely upon *self*, and not upon books; but especially upon the Holy Spirit. Let him study his sermon as assiduously as if success depended wholly upon himself, but go into the pulpit feeling his weakness to such a degree as to make him rely solely upon the Holy Spirit for success. Let his preaching be characterized by the unction of the Holy Spirit—his soul being on fire with the love of Jesus—and his words will sink deep into the hearts of his hearers, and the fruits of his ministry will be seen in the sound conversion of many. Let him thus labor for one, two, or three years, and then he will be prepared to make an efficient pastor. In his pastoral labors, let him follow the instructions given to Timothy by Paul, and he will see the work of the Lord steadily progress under his labors. There is an additional duty which is imperative: he must constantly direct his efforts to train his people to be co-workers with him in the Lord's vineyard.

Some object to the method of labor as indicated in that of a circuit-rider, on the ground that it is conducive to indolence, because he can preach the same sermon at his various appointments, and thus make a few discourses answer for a whole year's labor. The very fact that he can preach the same discourse several times, is one special advantage connected with this method. If the young man be influenced by love for immortal souls, and his love for his dear Redeemer, he will not be indolent, but will, each time he repeats a discourse, try to improve it. He thus can prepare a few sermons which he can preach at any time in after life, without special preparation. Some of the best discourses of the writer were thus prepared while he was on the circuit.

Let, then, the minister be called of God, as was Aaron, with a proper appreciation of his work; with a mind well disciplined by a thorough course of literary, scientific, and profes-

sional study; and with a heart filled with the Holy Spirit. Then in him will be fulfilled the character which the prophet saw, looking, by the aid of inspiration, down the long vista of time, as he exclaimed: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation!"

ART. XI.—*Justification.*

THE doctrine of justification is one of the most important taught in the Bible. It is juridical in its character. It has reference to sovereign and subjects, government and law, rewards and punishments. God is the supreme sovereign of the universe. The universe is composed of spirit and matter. The government is physical and moral; so are the laws and subjects. So far as we have any knowledge, either from observation or revelation, the subjects of moral government consist of angels and men. God's moral government, like himself, in its principles is wise, just, pure, and good. The moral law, like its Author, is perfect, immutable, eternal, holy, just, and good. It requires of its subjects personal, perfect, and perpetual obedience. It bestows, as a suitable reward, life and happiness on the obedient, and inflicts, as a just penalty, death and misery on the disobedient.

Our first parents, in their primal state, were "endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after his own [God's] image;" having the law of God written in their hearts, and power to fulfill it; and yet, under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will which was subject unto change. They were put upon trial to test their obedience; but they sinned in eating the forbidden fruit, and thus brought guilt upon themselves, "whereby they were bound over to the wrath of God and curse of the law, and so made subject to death, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternal."

From what has been stated in regard to the law, it is evident the transgressor must suffer its penalty forever, unless by some means he can be restored to a righteous standing in view thereof. "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so, as a natural man, being altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, he is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself." He has therefore no ability to meet the demands of the law by obedience. Again, inasmuch as the law requires perfect obedience at all times, man, having once sinned, has no time allotted to him to make amends for that one sin; so his guilt would forever remain, "for whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." It is impossible for him to supererogate. And for this reason an angel, or all the angels combined, could not render any obedience for the benefit of the culprit. If, therefore, fallen man be saved, help must come from some other than himself or angels. The word of God reveals to us a Saviour. Paul says: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners;" and, when the angel announced to his reputed father the coming "Son of God," he said: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins."

The inquiry arises here, How will Jesus save the sinner? In answer we say, not by abrogating the law, nor modifying in any manner its demands against the sinner. Christ says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." "For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Again: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail." Christ will save the sinner by becoming man's substitute, and for him meeting the demands the law held against him—its demands both for obedience to its precepts, and for suffering its penalty; for man, having become obnoxious to its penalty, was not released from obligation to keep its precepts. Jesus Christ, being the Son of God, possessed equality with the Father, and, in the fullness of time, assumed a perfect human nature; so that he was qualified as the God-man

to perform the great work he came to execute. "For, when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." Because of the personal union between the divinity and humanity of Christ, constituting him "very God and very man—yet one Christ"—a Divine or an infinite value was given to all he did as man's substitute; so that, by his perfect obedience, and infinitely meritorious suffering and death, the law was as fully vindicated and satisfied as if Adam and all his posterity had fully obeyed the precepts of the law, on the one hand, or, on the other, had suffered the infliction of its penalty forever. Thus it was he made a full atonement for sin, and brought in an everlasting righteousness which God recognizes as a law-fulfilling, satisfactory consideration; in view of which he justifies the sinner who becomes the beneficiary thereof. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous." "For God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." "Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification."

We are now prepared to consider justification in its execution or bestowment, or as applied to its recipient. Chapter XI. of the Confession of Faith gives this statement of it: "Those whom God calleth, (and who obey the call,) he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith." Justification, then, consists, first, in the pardon of sins. This is an act of the Sovereign—a judicial act: it is not a work done in the sinner, but takes place in the court of heaven. It does not affect man's moral nature, but changes his standing in relation to law. His sins involved guilt; and guilt, condemnation; and condemnation, punishment; hence, if sin be par-

doned, guilt is cancelled; if guilt be cancelled, condemnation is abrogated; if condemnation be abrogated, the penalty is annulled. "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." They are judicially regarded as innocent as if they never had committed sin; and they are now personally accepted and accounted righteous—not that righteousness has been infused into them, nor that they have actually been made righteous, but are pronounced or held to be righteous in law.

Justification, from its very nature, is an instantaneous, full, and complete work. It is the expression of God's decision. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." If the sinner be justified, the law, of necessity, must be satisfied. If the law be satisfied, it must be in consideration of a perfect righteousness. If, in view of a perfect righteousness, it cannot be by any righteousness the sinner can present of his own, or originating in himself; for all his "righteousness is as filthy rags." Therefore, it must be the righteousness of another. But the Scriptures mention no righteousness, as connected with the justification of the ungodly, but the righteousness of Christ. The conclusion, consequently, is that the righteousness of Christ is the meritorious, and the only, cause of justification. The Catechism teaches that God justifies us "only for the righteousness of Christ." Paul says: "Being freely justified by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." From which we understand that it is in consideration of Christ's righteousness—be that whatever it may be—that God can, consistently with the principles of his moral government, maintain the justice of his own act, and sustain the integrity of his administration, in view of his moral universe, when he justifies the ungodly.

For justification, the sinner must become personally interested in what Christ, as mediator, has done for him, or in the righteousness of Christ. The Confession of Faith says:

"Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone." Again: "Not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for *Christ's sake alone*; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them; they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith." What is called "the *righteousness of Christ*" in the first quotation, is, in the second, styled the "*obedience and satisfaction of Christ*;" that is, as we understand, what, as mediator, he did and suffered for us. It is written: "Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." Again: "And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Again: "For Christ also hath once suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." Therefore we do not understand it to be his righteousness as God, or as man, that is imputed, but his mediatorial righteousness.

The doctrine of imputed righteousness has been long and much controverted. It is altogether rejected by some; and among those who accept it as true, there is still a difference in regard to its true construction. It seems clear that, if it is because of the righteousness of Christ that *God justifies* us—and this we think we have already sufficiently shown from the Scriptures—it logically follows that, because, or on account, of the same, *we are justified*. Then we become interested in Christ's righteousness to such an extent, or in such a manner, that we are treated as if it were our own; for we obtain and enjoy the full benefit thereof. Whether, therefore, the term impute is to be taken literally or tropically, it is certainly scriptural to claim Christ as "the Lord our righteousness," and to say that he "of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

So far, then, as the agency of God is exercised in our becoming personally interested in the righteousness of Christ, it consists in his act of imputation; and our agency is exercised

in receiving it—"receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith."

Now we conclude that God bestows justification on us, either on principles of absolute sovereignty—that is, without any condition performed on our part—or he recognizes man as a free agent, and requires of him some suitable condition in order to his receiving the gift of righteousness.

While the Confession of Faith does not clearly state it, yet it is evidently its teaching, that justification is conditionally offered to sinners, and that faith is the condition. Chapter XI. says: "Those whom God calleth, (and who *obey* the call.)" We assume, without stopping to prove it, that the parenthetical clause means, that those who *believe* in Christ "he also freely justifieth," etc., and that it was added in our Confession to show that justification is not unconditional, as might appear to be the teaching of the section without it. By condition we mean the necessary prerequisite—the indispensable contingency to the sequence. If a man had every other prerequisite—and there are others which are antecedent to faith—yet without faith he cannot be justified. To support this view of the subject, we quote the following: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed." "To declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness; that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." "Therefore we conclude a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." "By him, all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every man that believeth." "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." "What must I do to be saved? Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not

see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." From all which, and many more that might be introduced, the fact seems clearly established, that faith—the act of believing—is the condition of justification. We here add, that faith is not only the condition, but the *only* condition, of justification.

Justification, or salvation, is represented in the Scriptures to be by faith; also by *grace*, in opposition to *works*. "Therefore, by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." "And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise, work is no more work." "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are *justified by the law*; ye are *fallen from grace*." "Therefore it is of faith, that it may be by *grace*."

Faith is not only the condition, and the only condition, of justification, but is also "the alone instrument" by which we receive Christ and his righteousness, by which we are justified. As the hand is to the body, so is faith to the soul. With the hand we receive and appropriate food and clothing for the body; so with the hand of faith we receive "the bread that came down from heaven, of which, if a man eat, he shall never die"—and that bread is Christ. We also, by the same instrument, receive the garment of salvation, the wedding garment, which is the robe of righteousness. The same texts that prove faith to be the only condition, also prove it to be the only instrument of justification. We quote again from the Confession of Faith: "Christ, by his obedience and death,

did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf. Yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for any thing in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners."

Let us illustrate this in connection with some other features of justification already set forth. Suppose three parties—an insolvent debtor, a creditor, and a third person. The debtor, who is an uncompromising enemy, without cause, to both the other parties, and has no disposition to pay, is put in prison, to remain there until he pays the debt, which, by the supposition, he can never do. The third party having ample means, without consulting him, through mere pity, by agreement with the creditor, pays the debt, and makes an overture to the debtor, reasonable, honorable, and of easy compliance, upon the acceptance of which the debtor shall have the benefit of what has been done, as fully as though he had paid it himself, and shall also be set at liberty. In addition thereto he shall have settled upon him for life a large estate. Upon hearing the overture, the prisoner accepts the condition, and enjoys all that was proffered him by his kind benefactor. Now, by this arrangement, the ends of civil law and justice are as fully met as if the debtor had met the obligation himself; and all the benefits accrue to him by unmerited kindness.

By this illustration, we do not mean to teach that the atonement is to be regarded in the sense of a commercial transaction, and that it required just so much obedience and suffering to save a certain and definite number, and that those for whom it was made will all be saved; for it has been before shown that the atonement has infinite value, and that justification is not unconditionally bestowed on any man. It is intended, as far as the figure will apply, to illustrate the features of the doctrine of justification as herein set forth, showing the utter helplessness of our sin-cursed race under the condemnation and curse of the law of God, and our entire estrangement from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Redeemer;

the justice of God's claims upon us; the love and compassion of God and our Saviour to us; the free and full atonement made for our sins; the easy, honorable, and gracious condition upon which the benefits of the atonement are offered to us; and the unspeakable blessings bestowed upon us, by our acceptance of the condition proposed; and that the salvation thus enjoyed is all of the free and abounding grace of God.

Being justified, the Holy Ghost instantly regenerates and adopts the believer, whereby he is qualified for heaven in his moral nature, and receives an authentic title "to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time."

TO OUR FRIENDS AND PATRONS.

It affords us pleasure to greet again our subscribers. For reasons which have been given in our Church-papers, this issue has been somewhat delayed; still it is in advance of several of our most prominent exchanges.

After expressing our heart-felt gratitude for the coöperation which we have *hitherto* received from every portion of the Church, and for the increasing interest which is *now* manifested in relation to the Quarterly, we enter upon the duties and labors of this year with renewed consecration and vigor.

The importance of such a publication as the Theological Medium, no one can doubt, who has bestowed any thought upon the subject. Without the expense and the time which few could, or would, afford to read voluminous works, the Quarterly presents to all the least expensive mode of informing themselves in regard to the Theology and Polity of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. It likewise presents a medium through which many able pens—pens, too, that would otherwise rust—may speak to our people. Besides, this publication is a bond of union; for no denomination which keeps its theological position well defined and strongly defended, can be rent into factions, or be disturbed by “damnable heresies.”

Let us as a Church press our claims upon the world. Nothing can be lost by a continued repetition of our doctrines. No obsolete dogmas clog our wheels; nor is there a single tenet belonging to our system, which may not be preached on all occasions. For such a system we should feel devoutly grateful to Almighty God; and, to increase its efficiency, let us give a still greater circulation to one of the most important auxiliaries belonging to us—The Theological Medium. To the ministry, especially, we look for assistance; for, with their coöperation, we feel well assured of success.

BOOK NOTICES.

China and the United States. By Rev. WILLIAM SPEER, D.D. National Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio. 8vo. Pp. 681.

For several years Dr. Speer was missionary to China, under the auspices of the Presbyterian Board. He was also the first minister who preached the gospel, in their own language, to the Chinese that immigrated to this country. No man, therefore, was better prepared to write "China and the United States."

The origin of the Chinese Empire is involved in uncertainty; but of one thing we are sure: it is the oldest in the world. It was planted in the earliest generations after the Deluge; and, while others have arisen, swayed the affairs of continents, and fallen, this stands in majestic grandeur, bidding defiance to the ravages of time. Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, with all their wealth and power, have passed away; but the Chinese race is still the same; and, judging the future by the past, we feel almost warranted in saying, the day is far distant when this empire will cease to be. During a long period, the language and literature of this people have remained the same; for it is asserted as a fact, that the school-books prepared by a contemporary of the Prophet Daniel are yet the manuals of the teachers of their children.

The population of China amounts to one-fourth of the entire family of man. In agricultural productiveness, the empire stands first among all the existing nations; it likewise occupies the first position in the sum-total of the wealth of its subjects. According to the last census, the present population of the empire amounts to *four hundred and fifteen millions!* The mind staggers beneath the conception of so vast a mass of human beings collected under one government, speaking, one kindred family of languages, writing identically the same

character, and entertaining the same general, social, and religious ideas.

The zoölogy of China is rich and varied; for it has within its wide limits and diversified surface, nearly all animals that are found in all the other countries of the globe: for instance, the elephant, the dromedary, the rhinoceros, the lion, the tiger, the leopard, the hyena, the jackal, etc., etc. The horse, the ox, the buffalo, the dog, the cat, the pig, have all been domesticated. Birds in the same variety are found; and it is said their plumage is not only beautiful, but brilliant. Fish are abundant; and great numbers of people on the coast are maintained by the fisheries.

In vegetable productions China is uncommonly rich. Oranges, lemons, tea, sugar-cane, rice, pomegranates, black and white mulberries, the vine, walnut, chestnut, peach, apricot, and fig are seen growing on the same spot of ground. Of all the productions of China, however, the tea-plant is the most interesting and important to us.

The government of China is despotic. Each ruler of a province maintains a court of his own; and, when he leaves his mansion, he is borne on a gilded chair, or sedan, followed by public executioners, some carrying chains, others that universal instrument of justice, the bamboo. Every one holding an official position is answerable for the conduct of those below him. Thus, if the country is inundated by the sudden rising of a river, the chief magistrate is considered in fault for not having repaired the embankments. Should lives or property fall a sacrifice to fire, it is presumed that they might have been saved by more active measures; consequently, the magistrates are blamed for not having a more efficient police, and the governors are censured for appointing such careless officers. The power of the emperor is unlimited. A single word from him is sufficient to deprive the first grandee of the land of his rank, his property, or even his life.

The condition of woman in China, and the position she holds in society, are not very accurately known. She is not often seen in the streets; but one cause of this is her inability to walk with ease, in consequence of the smallness of her feet. Upon the whole, however, hers is a position of great inferi-

ority, as is always the case where polygamy exists, and where the practice of buying and selling women prevails. It is said that a family of handsome daughters, especially if well trained in Chinese accomplishments, are often a great source of profit to their parents. The dress of a Chinese lady consists of a short, loose robe, confined round the neck with a narrow collar. The sleeves are wide, and sufficiently long to cover the hands; and the hair is gathered up in a knot at the top of the head. They all wear trowsers, and their tiny shoes are of satin, silk, or velvet, beautifully worked with gold, silver, and colored silks, the soles being made of layers of paper from one to two inches in thickness, and covered on the bottom with hog-skin. From the empress to the wife of the meanest peasant, all the females practice the spinning and weaving of silk.

By many the Chinese are looked upon as a most degraded, ignorant race. It must not be forgotten, however, that, in many respects, they are *far* in advance of any other heathen nation upon earth. Books are plentiful and remarkably cheap. The paper upon which they are printed, being thin and transparent, is impressed on one side only, and so folded that every leaf is double, with the edge uncut. Their books are not bound like ours; but every work is divided into a number of separate parts, with strong paper covers. Printing is executed very cheaply on wood, hardened wax, or metal. The most common method is by means of wooden blocks. There are in China no "public schools" as we have them; still, they have some excellent institutions, founded by the munificence of the wealthy. One of the favorite maxims of the Chinese is: "By learning, the sons of the poor become great; without learning, the sons of the great are mixed with the common people." The master of a district school is paid at the rate of two dollars a year for each student; yet even this small sum cannot well be spared by a laboring man whose wages are only a few pennies a day. The examinations in their schools are said to be of a most rigid character. Each student is shut up alone; but, before entering his cell, he is rigidly searched by the judges to see that he has neither books nor papers.

Gambling is a besetting sin of the Chinese. From childhood to old age they never get rid of the propensity. They use cards, dice, dominoes, and other contrivances; and it is said that the populace bet upon any thing, from two crickets in a basin to a combat of game-cocks. Among their out-door amusements that of kite-flying is carried to a degree of perfection unseen in any other country. The kites are made in a variety of forms, as of birds, butterflies, fishes; and they often try their skill in bringing down each other's kites, in imitation of hawking.

The Chinese are a religious people. Their objects of worship are generally their deceased sages, heroes, emperors, or ancestors. Every house, belonging either to rich or poor, has its household gods to which offerings are made, consisting of cakes, rice, plates of meat, and cups of tea, which are placed before the images; and all that is not consumed (?) is appropriated by the family. Confucius was their great religious instructor. He was to Eastern Asia what Luther was to Western Europe—the great harbinger of the departure of an old, corrupt, iron age. As he was born about 550 B.C., he was nearly contemporaneous with the Prophet Daniel. Considering the age in which he lived, and the meager advantages which he enjoyed, he was, beyond doubt, a man of extraordinary abilities. The books written by him are universally studied by the Chinese as sacred volumes.

The deepest hatred toward England exists in the bosom of every adult inhabitant of China, because of the "Opium trade." The following, written by one of their wisest statesmen, is a specimen of this bitterness: "Behold that vile English nation! Its ruler is at one time a woman, then a man, and then perhaps a woman again; its people are at one time like vultures, and then they are like wild beasts, with dispositions more fierce than the tiger or wolf, and natures more greedy than anacondas or swine. These people have stealthily devoured all the Western barbarians; and, like demons of the night, they now suddenly exalt themselves here. Verily the English barbarians murder all of us that they can. They are dogs whose desires can never be satisfied. Therefore we need not inquire whether the peace they have made be real or pre-

tended. Let us all rise, arm, unite, and go against them! We do hereby bind ourselves to vengeance, and express these our sincere intentions in order to exhibit our high principles and patriotism. The gods from on high now look down on us; let us not lose our just and firm resolution!"

The foregoing points, in regard to the Chinese, we gathered from a hasty perusal of the book which we have under consideration. In many instances we have copied the language of the author; and, if any apology is needed for making this notice more elaborate than is our custom, we plead, in extenuation, the interest of the subject. We therefore return our thanks to Dr. Speer for his able and interesting book.

The Sunday-school Idea. By JOHN S. HART, LL.D. J. C. Garrigues & Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 16mo. Pp. 416.

The design of this book is to give a general survey of the whole subject of Sunday-schools. Dr. Hart is a Christian scholar, an experienced educator in the secular field, and, for many years, editor of the Sunday-school Times. In some respects, this book is the best we have seen on the subject; for it covers more ground, and is the result of many years' intimate relation with the young. There is scarcely any feature of the Sunday-school work which has not, at one time or another, come up for Dr. Hart's personal, practical consideration; and he presents, in his book, the whole rounded idea of what the Sunday-school is, and of what it is capable.

On one point we are especially delighted with the sentiments of Dr. Hart. In regard to closing Sabbath schools in the winter, he says:

"The Sunday-school is subject to two evils, of a kind exactly the opposite of each other, yet alike in their pernicious effects. City schools are very generally closed for a couple of months in midsummer, country schools for a like, sometimes even for a longer, period in winter. This latter practice is not, perhaps, as general as the other. But where it does prevail, the habit is usually inveterate, and it requires no little resolution and energy to break it up. In many neighborhoods in the country, it is assumed as a thing certain, and not to be called in question, that the Sunday-school cannot be main-

tained in winter. The people would as soon expect to raise a crop of corn or of peaches in winter as to keep the Sunday-school open. They expect, as a matter of course, to close it about the middle of November, and not to open it again until spring.

"How this practice originated it is difficult to say. Perhaps it was in those old times, which some of us can remember, when the churches were not warmed in winter, and when, consequently, there would be some practical inconveniences in holding the school. This cause, at least, no longer exists. The rooms where the school is held may be made as comfortable in winter as at any other season. For that matter, indeed, the school-room may be made more comfortable in midwinter than in midsummer. It may be warmed in the coldest weather, but it cannot always be cooled in the heats of July.

"Will not the teachers, and superintendents, and other Christian people, in those districts where this periodical Sunday-school hibernation takes place, give the subject a respectful reconsideration? Is there any valid reason why the schools should be thus closed for three or four months in the year? The church is not closed in winter; why should the school be? The week-day school is not closed; why close the Sunday-school? The children can go out to skate, and ride down hill, and build snow-forts from Monday to Saturday; how is it that they become all at once so delicate and tender on Sunday morning? Winter in the country is the season above all others when social gatherings of all kinds are opportune and rife; why should the weekly gathering of the children in their loved Sunday-school be the only exception?

"There are weighty reasons, physiological, social, and domestic, why a country Sunday-school should be maintained in winter more than in any other season of the year. In the long winter evenings in the country there is more leisure for study and for preparing lessons than at other times. The teachers of country Sunday-schools have then more time upon their hands, particularly the male teachers, and can, with less sacrifice of business engagements, prepare themselves for their Sunday duties. Farmers have winter work, it is true, but it is not so pressing and imperious in its demands as the work

of 'seed-time and harvest.' Then there is no time when mental operations are so vigorous, when the business of learning and teaching can be conducted with so much effect, as in the crisp, frosty days of winter. The cold is a mighty tonic, both to the mind and the body."

A Commentary—Critical and Explanatory—on the Old and New Testaments. By Rev. ROBERT JAMIESON, D.D., Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, A.M., and Rev. DAVID BROWN, D.D. National Publishing Company, Cincinnati, O. 4to. Pp. 1347.

There are many Commentaries on the sacred Scriptures; some of them are excellent, but none of them are faultless. The Bible is a wonderful book; and, in all ages, since it was written, it has laid under tribute the purest hearts and the brightest intellects. As the wise men of the East presented their most costly gifts at the feet of Jesus, so the richest treasures of learning have been offered at the shrine of the Book of books. No mortal, however, can increase the brilliancy of the sun. Human contrivances, it is true, may decompose its rays, that their variegated beauty may be seen; and the same power may even cause its light to enter abodes which, otherwise, might not be illuminated.

Some Commentaries, popular at this day, require to be read with great caution; for they are unsafe and treacherous guides. The one before us, however, we consider, in the main, sound and evangelical. It is a large volume, and a compact one; yet the sense is not obscured. Without the show and parade of learning, it presents the results of extended and careful research, and is, in fact, a learned work. The book deserves, and, we doubt not, will receive, an extensive circulation; for, next in importance to the Bible itself, is a good commentary upon the sacred text. The following are some of the prominent features claimed for the work:

"Its compendious character and comprehensiveness. Nearly all the writers upon Scripture, ancient and modern, have been laid under contribution by the authors; and what was heretofore scattered through a great number of original works will here be found collected and compressed into one volume, which, as it embodies the results of all previous research and

scholarship, must, therefore, soon become the received commentary of evangelical Christians.

"A critical introduction to each book gives an account of the author, the nature of its contents, the evidence of its genuineness, and its analysis and history.

"Notes, concise, learned, free from verbiage, and easily understood, constitute the body of the work. The explanatory and philological notes clear up the meaning of words which, since the time of the translators, have become, either in whole or in part, obsolete, changed their significance, or are of less comprehensive import. They account for and explain apparent discrepancies, whether in history, chronology, or any other department of Biblical knowledge. Passages of Scripture difficult to be understood, or whose import is not readily apprehended, they elucidate and explain. By a reference to natural objects and phenomena, to idioms, customs, and manners peculiar to the age of the sacred writers, or to Oriental countries, they illustrate the ideas and images used in Scripture. In the light of modern exploration and research, they explain the geography, natural history, and antiquities of Bible lands.

"The expository and practical notes show the authors to be devout Christians, as well as scholars and divines, and are calculated to promote the more intelligent perusal of the Scriptures, and throw a new light from the stand-point of faith upon its pages, and assist abundantly in devout communion with the word of life.

"The numerous illustrations, many of them taken on the spot, or copied from real objects, cannot be too highly appreciated. They serve materially to illustrate the text, and, in some cases, are almost indispensable to a right understanding of the subject. They attract the attention of all classes of readers, and impress Scripture scenes and subjects upon the memory.

"While this is the most practical, suggestive, scientific, and popular Commentary yet published in this country, its compact form and convenient size, together with the immense amount of matter it contains, forming an encyclopedia of Biblical knowledge, render it also at once the *cheapest and most economical*."

Why am I a Cumberland Presbyterian? By Rev. R. BEARD, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn. Board of Publication of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. 8vo. Pp. 149.

Some two or three years ago, the Board of Publication offered one hundred dollars for the best essay in answer to the question, *Why am I a Cumberland Presbyterian?* During the first year there were several competitors for the prize; but not one of the pieces submitted was entirely acceptable to the committee of examination. They were all, therefore, rejected, and the proposition renewed, with the promise of an additional hundred dollars. At the close of the second year, the committee met again; and, after proper deliberation, selected the essay presented by Dr. Beard.

The work is gotten up in good style; and hundreds, yea, thousands, perhaps, are now reading it with interest and profit. Dr. Beard is, *ex confesso*, one of the ablest theologians in the Church with which he has been so long and so prominently connected. As an author, he has gained a wide reputation, not only in his own Church, but in other Christian Communions.

Garden of Sorrows; or, Ministry of Tears. By Rev. JOHN ATKINSON. Carlton & Lanahan, New York. 8vo. Pp. 203.

This volume contemplates human sorrow from the standpoint of Gethsemane, in the light of Revelation and of Christian faith. Seldom, indeed, have we perused a book with more interest. The style is pure and elevated; no one, therefore, can read the work without being benefited. Every minister and every private Christian should have a copy. We give a specimen of the style in which the book is written. Under the caption "Gethsemane," the author says:

"On all humanity rests the curse of tears.

"Earth is resonant with the sighs of the sorrowing. The wails of heart-anguish pierce the deepest solitudes, and the cry of the troubled is always ascending to the ear of God. Wherever there are human habitations there is a 'house of mourning;' and wherever, amidst festive scenes and the companionship of mirth, smiles and songs express pervading happiness, strains of sadness also linger, hushed or vocal, a

melancholy undertone from spirit-chords swept by unseen griefs. *'Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward;'* and somewhere, at some time, on every bosom does the sorrowful allotment rest.

"In all this there is nothing novel. From Eden rang the first cry of woe. And all along, since the withering blight fell upon the bloom of the garden of innocence, has the human race, in its successive generations, bowed beneath its inexorable doom of sorrow. The ages have furnished no chronicler who recites the story of a people free from tribulation, and no explorer who has discovered a clime where hearts may not ache, and tears may not flow. On all the earth the curse rests; for the malediction which made Eden solitary, contained this terrible execration: *'Cursed is the ground for thy sake.'*"

The Song of the Redeemed, Salvation to God, and to the Lamb.

By J. W. HARSHA, A.M., late Professor in Westminster College. J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

This is a most readable book. It is gotten up in fine style, and is creditable to both author and publishers. The theology is Cumberland Presbyterian; it has, therefore, the "true ring," according to our views. We give an extract. He says:

"The invitation is given to all—to the young and the old in sin. It is irrespective of age, or sex, or condition, or nation. It is broad as the sentence of the law, which includes all sinners, and declares, 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' It includes sinners of every degree of guilt—the whole human race—all the ends of the earth.

"The invitation proceeds on the all-sufficiency of the atonement. By virtue of it, we are authorized to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. In the beautiful language of Isaiah, God says of his only begotten and well-beloved Son: 'I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayst be my salvation unto the end of the earth.' (Isa. xlix. 6.) And now the Son himself cries, in the same exalted and inviting strains: 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.' 'Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' 'The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth

say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And *whosoever* will, let him take the water of life freely.' 'Wisdom crieth in the top of high places—at the gates—at the entry of the city—at the coming in at the doors: Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of man.' (Pr. viii.) 'In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If *any* man thirst, let him come unto me and drink.' O what encouraging invitations are these to a lost world!

"Jesus invites all—invites you as sinners ready to perish, needing salvation. As no merit is required to commend us to God, so no demerit excludes us from his favors. As there is nothing in the nature of the gospel to exclude any sinner, so there is nothing in any sinner—nothing that he has done, is, or may be—to exclude him from the gospel call."

A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Baptist Theological Seminary, Greenville, S. C. Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia. 8vo. Pp. 514.

We have examined this work with some care, and unhesitatingly pronounce it excellent. Dr. Broadus is one of the most learned ministers in the Baptist Church; nor is his reputation as a terse writer and vigorous thinker confined to his own denomination. The treatise under consideration is admirably adapted to the wants of young ministers; and we would be glad to know that a copy of the work is in the library of every one aspiring to the sacred profession. Among the many treatises which have been published on this important subject, we know of none superior to this as a text-book for Theological Seminaries. In the Introduction, the author says:

"Preaching is characteristic of Christianity. No false religion has ever provided for the regular and frequent assembling of the masses of men, to hear religious instruction and exhortation.* Judaism had something like it in the prophets, and afterward in the readers and speakers of the synagogue; but Judaism was a true religion, designed to be developed into Christianity.

* Comp. Vinet, p. 21.

"The great appointed means of spreading the good tidings of salvation through Christ is preaching—words spoken, whether to the individual, or to the assembly. And this nothing can supersede. *Printing* has become a mighty agency for good and for evil; and Christians should employ it, with the utmost diligence, and in every possible way, for the spread of truth. But printing can never take the place of the living word. When a man who is apt in teaching, whose soul is on fire with the truth which he trusts has saved him, and hopes will save others; speaks to his fellow-men, face to face, eye to eye; and electric sympathies flash to and fro between him and his hearers, till they lift each other up, higher and higher, into the intensest thought, and the most impassioned emotion—higher and yet higher, till they are borne as on chariots of fire above the world—there is a power to move men, to influence character, life, destiny, such as no printed page can ever possess. *Pastoral work* is of immense importance, and all preachers should be diligent in performing it. But it cannot take the place of preaching, nor fully compensate for lack of power in the pulpit.

"Religious ceremonies may be instructive and impressive. The older dispensation made much use of these, as we employ pictures in teaching children. Even Christianity, which has the minimum of ceremony, illustrates its fundamental facts, and often makes deep religious impressions by its too simple, but expressive, ordinances. But these are merely pictures to illustrate, merely helps to that great work of teaching and convincing, of winning and holding men, which preaching, made mighty by God's Spirit, has to perform."

Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. By R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D.,
Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church,
Oxford. Gould & Lincoln, Boston.

Christianity has fought a thousand battles; and, in all of them, she has been victorious. Her banner has never trailed in the dust, no difference how numerous or how powerful were her foes. Infidelity, however, has contested every inch of ground; and, in no case, has it yielded until completely vanquished. The triumphs of Christianity, therefore, have not been effected without cost.

The design of the book before us is to show that there exists in the Old Testament an element which no criticism on naturalistic principles can either account for or explain away. That element is Prophecy; and the author proves successfully that its force does not consist merely in its predictions.

The mighty contest to-day between Christianity and infidelity is over the person and mission of Jesus Christ. For one, we are glad that the decisive battle is to be fought upon this issue; for there can be no doubt as to the result. If Christ is not God, then the Bible is a myth, and Christianity a failure.

We take pleasure in recommending for general reading, and as worthy of the student's acquisition, this very welcome and ably-written book—a book of much value and utility, and one especially adapted to the wants of every Christian minister.

How and Why. By RUSSELL H. CONWELL. Lee & Shepard, Boston. 12mo. Pp. 283.

This is a book which every one should read. The author made an extensive tour through China, and he gives such facts and thoughts as have required his earnest, unbiased investigation. The design of the work is to show why and how the Chinese immigrate to the United States. He tells—and no doubt he is correct—that the vast number which we are welcoming to our shores is due to their dissatisfaction with their government and customs at home. Speaking of the government of the Empire, and the tyranny of the Emperor, he says: "The very thought of four hundred millions swayed by a single mind—made rich or poor, miserable or happy, by the nod of a single man—fills the mind with awe and astonishment. The Emperor can appoint new officers, and create new gods. He can control the spirits of men in the body and out. He owns all the land of the Empire, and all the property-holders are his tenants-at-will. The Governors of the different provinces and districts know no higher law than to do his bidding."

We have not the space to give the book the notice it deserves; but we advise all who wish to learn much that is desirable to be known in regard to the Chinese, to procure the work, and give it a careful reading.

[*Other book notices crowded out.*]

